



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2021

No. 106

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, although we cannot see You with our eyes or touch You with our hands, we have experienced the reality of Your might and majesty. Every time we hear a newborn baby cry or touch a leaf or see the sky, we know why we believe.

Lord, send Your spirit to fill the hearts of our Senators. As they journey toward eternity, may they walk, Lord, this day on the path You have provided. Give them a passion to glorify You in their thoughts, words, and deeds. Provide them with the wisdom to embrace truth, honor, gentleness, and humility.

We pray in Your righteous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, ever since Democrats passed the Affordable Care Act, expanding health coverage and access to tens of millions of Americans, we have had to fight tooth and nail to preserve the law from partisan Republican attacks.

For more than a decade, the assault on our healthcare law was relentless from Republicans in Congress, from the executive branch itself and from Republican attorneys general in the courts. In a landmark vote, we in the Senate prevented the Republicans from repealing the ACA in 2017.

Each time, in each arena, the Affordable Care Act has prevailed, and once again today, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 7-to-2 ruling, upheld the Affordable Care Act in the face of another legal challenge. So let me say definitively: The Affordable Care Act has won. The Supreme Court has just ruled. The ACA is here to stay.

And now we are going to try to make it bigger and better—establish once and for all affordable healthcare as a basic right of every American citizen.

What a day.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another issue, infrastructure, despite a consensus in Washington that America needs more investment in our infrastructure, it has been decades since Congress passed a stand-alone bill to address the issue. This Congress is working hard to remedy that fact.

As I have repeated, discussions about infrastructure are moving forward along two tracks. One is bipartisan, and the second deals with components of the American jobs and families plan, which we will consider even if it lacks bipartisan support—though, I would note that a recent poll showed that President Biden's infrastructure and family plan is broadly popular. Nearly 70 percent of Americans support President Biden's infrastructure plan. More than 60 percent support additional support for American families.

Now, despite some overdramatized punditry, the truth is both tracks are moving forward very well, and both tracks need each other. So we want to work with our Republican colleagues on infrastructure where we have common ground, and Democrats believe we have other priorities that the Senate must consider above and beyond a bipartisan infrastructure bill, not the least of which is addressing the urgent challenge of climate change.

Yesterday, I convened all 11 Members of the Senate Budget Committee to discuss the reconciliation track. And today, I will convene the group of Democrats negotiating with Republicans to discuss the bipartisan track. We set up the two tracks about a month ago. Each is proceeding along, and the two tracks are parallel, working in concert, progressing well.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on voting rights, now we are here on the precipice of a momentous debate here in the Senate. Last night, I began the

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4599

process to consider voting rights legislation here on the floor of the Senate next week. The process I used will allow the Senate to consider S. 1 or compromise legislation that is currently being discussed. In either case, our goal remains crystal clear: protect the right to vote, strengthen our democracy, and put a stop to the tide of voter suppression flooding across our country. We will not consider legislation that does not achieve those objectives. The issue is too important.

Republican State legislatures are conducting the most sweeping attack on the right to vote since the beginning of Jim Crow. What is their stated reason for vicious assaults on voting rights? They say it is election integrity.

But listen to these policies and tell me if you think they are about election integrity:

Reducing polling hours and polling places. What does that have to do with election integrity?

Mandating that every precinct, no matter how large or how small, have the same number of ballot drop boxes. What does that have to do with election integrity?

It is saying urban areas should have less ability to vote than rural areas.

No after-hours voting, no 24-hours voting, no drive-through voting.

Requiring absentee ballots to be approved by a notary public.

Making it a crime to give food and water to voters waiting in long lines at the polls.

Allowing a judge or panel of judges to overturn an election.

Allowing a partisan State election board to replace a duly elected county election board if they are "underperforming."

Removing student IDs from the list of valid forms of ID.

Moving the hours of Sunday voting into the evening—which, coincidentally, makes it harder for Black churches to sponsor voter drives after services.

Are any of these policies—I would ask a single Republican on this Senate floor to get up and say any of these policies are dealing with election integrity.

We know what they are doing. They are making it harder for people to vote. And if this so-called voter fraud—election fraud—which we have seen none of in 2020, if they cared about that across the board, why did they aim almost all of their proposals at people of color, at poor people, at young people, at urban people?

We know why. This is not about voter fraud. It is about suppressing the vote, particularly of Democratic-leaning voters. It is despicable. It is anti-democratic. It is what they do in dictatorships—manipulate the vote, instead of counting it accurately.

Georgia, Iowa, Montana, Florida, Alabama, Utah, Arizona, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Indiana, Kentucky, Arkansas—this is where some of these poli-

cies that I just mentioned are now law. They would also be in effect in Texas had Democratic lawmakers not walked out of the chamber in protest. Since the beginning of the year, 14 States have enacted 22 laws—22 laws—to make it harder to vote.

Now, I know what the Republicans are saying. They are saying: Oh, well, we are making it easier to vote but harder to cheat.

But when you look at what they are actually doing, it is perfectly clear that Republicans across the country are making it harder to vote and making it easier to steal an election. They are targeting all the ways that poorer, younger, non-White and typically Democratic voters access the ballot, and they are giving new tools to partisan election boards and unelected judges to interfere with the results of a democratic election—interfere with the results of a democratic election. Does that sound like a democracy? No, it sounds like an autocracy, a dictatorship.

When you lose an election, you are supposed to try to win over more voters, not try to stop the other side from voting. These laws are un-American, autocratic, and against the very, very grain of our grand democracy, which, for immediate partisan advantage, our Republican friends are trying to undermine.

So the Senate is going to debate what to do about these laws at the Federal level next week. In an ideal world, this debate would be bipartisan. Voting rights shouldn't be a Democratic issue or a Republican issue, and in the early days of the second-half of the last century, that is just what it was—bipartisan. But, unfortunately, now it has become totally partisan.

Donald Trump and his Big Lie have enveloped the Republican Party, and they run away from truth and honesty and fairness to just appease someone with authoritarian instincts, Donald J. Trump.

And for all the shame that Republican State legislators have brought upon themselves, Washington Republicans have not covered themselves in glory either. Here in Washington, Republicans have failed to forcefully and repeatedly stand up to the Big Lie that the last election was stolen from Donald Trump. That same Big Lie is fueling these voter suppression laws from one end of the country to the other. House Republicans are comparing January 6 to a tourist visit.

I was within 20 feet of these awful insurrectionists. They were not tourists. They were brandishing sticks and guns and this and that.

House Republicans also fired Congresswoman CHENEY. For what? Telling the truth that Joe Biden is President.

Just yesterday, 21 House Republicans voted against awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to the police officers who withstood the attack on the 6th. Are Republicans becoming antipolice? Some of the same Republicans who

falsely accuse Democrats of wanting to defund the police are actively refusing to defend the police.

I wish I could say the Senate was totally different than the House—the Republican House—but here we have a Senate Republican saying that it really wasn't a violent insurrection. We have Senate Republicans refusing to include any mention of the causes for January 6 in committee reports, and the Republican minority mounted a partisan filibuster against an independent, bipartisan Commission.

That is what is happening in the present-day Republican Party: a hornet's nest of conspiracy theories and voter suppression in the States and a Washington Republican establishment that is too afraid of Donald Trump to stand up for our democracy with conviction.

So look, we Democrats wish the voting bill would be bipartisan. By all rights, it should be. But the actions in State legislatures like Georgia, Iowa, and Florida were totally partisan. None of these voter suppression laws were passed with bipartisan support—not one. Washington Republicans seem dead set against all remedies, whether it is S. 1, some modified version, or the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, which Senator MCCONNELL has recently opposed. So the idea that we can have some kind of bipartisan solution to this partisan attack on democracy befuddles me. Regrettably, the Democratic Party is the only party standing up for democracy right now.

Next week, the Senate will have this debate. Democrats will bring forward legislation to protect voting rights and safeguard our democracy, and we are going to see where everyone stands—everyone.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2093

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2093) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in order to place the bill on the calendar

under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, next week, as the Democratic leader has indicated, the Senate will finally get the opportunity to vote on the bill that House and Senate Democrats have both made their No. 1 priority for the entire Congress. S. 1 is a bad bill filled with bad ideas, and I have been crystal clear about opposing it from the very beginning.

But for Democrats themselves, coming up with a compelling rationale for this unprecedented political power grab has been a long and winding road. It started back in 2019. Then, our friends on the left were still trying to wrap their heads around a stunning defeat in the 2016 Presidential election, so the Speaker of the House billed H.R. 1 as a major overhaul for what her party concluded was a profoundly broken democracy.

Then, 2020 changed everything. A Democrat actually won the White House. I guess our democracy wasn't broken after all. This time, apparently, Federal authorities just needed urgent protection from State legislatures running their own elections.

So we are talking about fundamentally the very same bill. And one thing is for certain: Major overhaul doesn't even begin—begin—to describe it. The awful guts are all in there.

There is the plan to forcibly rewrite large portions of the 50 States' respective election laws and the plan to create new, publicly funded accounts not for building roads or bridges, expanding rural broadband, or fighting the opioid epidemic, but just piles of Federal dollars going to yard signs, balloons, and TV ads for candidates at least half of Americans disagree with.

There is the plan to trash a decades-old, bipartisan consensus on the right way to call balls and strikes on elections and turn the even split of the Federal Election Commission into a partisan majority and the one to give that majority new and broader tools

for chilling the rights of citizens to engage in political speech it doesn't like.

It is such a radical proposal that even prominent voices on the left have urged caution. Lawyers from ACLU, no less, have sounded the alarm on its proposed encroachment on free speech. One liberal expert went further, saying that if Democrats think their bill is "essential to secure democracy, they are self-deceived or deceitful." And voters themselves are hardly convinced. When asked about election policies like voter ID, large—large—majorities consistently come down on the opposite side of Washington Democrats. The bill is so transparently opportunistic, the Democrats' spin has failed to even unite their own party here in the Senate. It is a massive takeover of our election system with a fill-in-the-blank rationale. Nobody is fooled, and next week, the Senate will reject it.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on another matter entirely, the House of Representatives will vote today on a bill from Representative BARBARA LEE to repeal one of the key authorities behind nearly two decades of U.S. efforts to fight terrorism: the 2002 authorization for the use of military force. House Democrats claim this vote is an urgent act of congressional oversight, and the Democratic leader has indicated the Senate will take it up with similar zeal.

The right way to address ongoing terrorist threats is a debate certainly worth having. I would have welcomed that debate before the Biden administration began its hasty retreat from Afghanistan without a plan to sustain counterterror missions or support our friends. It is one we should have before we vote to repeal these authorities. Reality is more complicated, more dangerous, and less politically convenient than its supporters actually believe.

The fact is, the legal and practical application of the 2002 AUMF extends far beyond the defeat of Saddam Hussein's regime, and tossing it aside without answering real questions about our ongoing efforts in the region is reckless.

So let's clear up some facts. The 2002 AUMF has been understood for years—years—to apply to a variety of threats emanating from Iraq. Administrations of both parties have cited it as an important legal foundation of our fight against ISIS. It has been used precisely because the ISIS caliphate that stretched into Syria emanated from Iraq after President Obama's withdrawal in 2011.

The 2002 AUMF is important in Iraq today because it provides authority for U.S. forces there to defend themselves from a variety of real, exigent threats. It is arguably even more important in Syria, where our personnel are present against the wishes of the brutal Assad regime, supporting local Kurdish and

Arab forces and conducting strikes against ISIS. And because ISIS and al-Qaida have sometimes diverged, legal analysts have suggested that the 2001 AUMF alone may be insufficient to authorize operations against ISIS.

Do supporters of this repeal fully understand the ways it might limit counterterrorism missions? How about cyber ops? How about support for Kurdish and Arab forces in Syria? How do they propose we respond to growing attacks against our forces and interests in Iraq?

What about the prospects for robust congressional oversight if the President is left to rely on unilateral article II authorities or even less transparent ones? We are learning a lesson in real time about withdrawing from Afghanistan without a plan. We shouldn't make the same mistake here. So I suspect this isn't really about reasserting congressional oversight. After all, when the last administration announced plans to withdraw from Syria and Afghanistan in 2019, two dozen Democrats joined my amendment opposing the decision and reasserting our role in foreign policy. But now, many of our colleagues no longer want to talk about what we should be doing to confront these ongoing threats.

A lot can happen in 2 years, I guess. The political winds have certainly changed. But one thing hasn't changed: The grave threats posed by ISIS, al-Qaida, and other terrorist groups are as real as they have ever been, and repealing AUMFs without agreeing on a set of new authorities up front will only lead to more uncertainty about what we are going to do about them.

For years, U.S. forces have been carefully handing more of the primary responsibilities for counterterrorism to brave local partners. Under the last administration, this allowed our military footprint in Iraq and Syria to shrink dramatically. But the only reason that worked is because our partners have been able to trust that the U.S. military is still authorized to back them up. Today, House Democrats intend to rip out one of the key authorities underpinning that trust.

As I understand it, Democrats don't even intend to stop there. They are also planning to take aim at the 2001 authorities that allow us to keep some of the most dangerous terrorists alive from taking more innocent American lives. The administration says it is looking into how best to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, that houses the absolute—absolute—worst of the worst, including Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the September 11 attack. But thus far, the administration is rather short on details. How does the President plan to do this? Does he intend to break the law and bring terrorists to the United States? Give them expanded legal rights? Further radicalize our prison population? Talk about domestic violent extremism. Or does the President intend to send KSM and his

terrorist cronies to Pakistan or Saudi Arabia before they have faced justice?

Closing Guantanamo Bay will not make Americans safer. It will not bring solace to the victims of terrorism. It will not make America more respected in the world. It won't solve the terrorist threat any more than repealing AUMFs will end their war against us.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JOHN K. TIEN

Mr. CARPER. Thank you, Madam President. I hope you are well today. Good to see you and our staff.

I rise this morning to applaud the nomination of COL John Tien. He has been selected by our President to serve as the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, a very big job and an important job.

I have the honor of currently serving as the senior member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, which is responsible for, among other things, overseeing the operations of the Department of Homeland Security.

REMEMBERING MADELEINE A. PETERS

Madam President, very sadly, my colleague GARY PETERS, who is the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, lost his mom this week, and he cannot be with us today. Normally, he would be here speaking on behalf of the nomination of Colonel Tien.

His mother, whom I know and personally and dearly—I have known her ever since Gary first joined us—she is a huge Detroit Tigers baseball fan, as am I. I had the pleasure of going with her to baseball games and considered her a kindred spirit.

I just want to, literally, as we think about Senator PETERS and his family this morning—I just want to ask, maybe, for a moment of silence to remember her and the Peters family.

Thank you.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Moment of silence.)

NOMINATION OF JOHN K. TIEN

Madam President, as many of our colleagues know, the Department of Homeland Security is still a fairly young Agency, created in response to the attacks on September 11, 2001.

I vividly remember the tragic events of that day, a day as beautiful as today—sunshine, blue skies—and then the whole world changed, literally, while I was riding the train from Wilmington to Washington, DC. I recall also, vividly, how the Members of this body pulled together that day and our country pulled together that day. We, with the U.S. House of Representatives, we, with the President George W. Bush, set aside partisan politics, and we created the 9/11 Commission and adopted the great majority of its recommendations.

My recollection was the cochairs of the 9/11 Commission, former Governor of New Jersey, Tom Kean, a Republican, highly regarded, my neighbor across the river, and Lee Hamilton, Congressman from Indiana, who was chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, one of my mentors—he was a Congressman years ago—they led a group, the 9/11 Commission. I think they came to agreement unanimously on 42 recommendations, passed them off to what would become the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. We adopted almost every one of them unanimously, and it did a lot of good for our country and provided a lot of protection for our country, for our homeland.

Among the recommendations that he made was the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the expansion of our committee's jurisdiction to include homeland security. Before that, we were the Committee on Governmental Affairs, which is important. It was an oversight committee. But with the addition of the Department of Homeland Security, that responsibility grew enormously.

But since then, our committee has taken on a very different purpose. I am proud of the work that we have done that has made Americans safer today.

As someone who was very much involved in helping to stand up and assemble the Department of Homeland Security, I am proud of the way it has grown and matured over the last 20 years. I remain convinced that it is, in large part, the leadership provided by the nominees we confirm in this Chamber that enables the Department of Homeland Security to carry out successfully as its many missions.

The Department of Homeland Security is an Agency with a budget of over

\$50 billion and a staff of almost a quarter million men and women who are collectively responsible for protecting our Nation from many of the threats that we face. From the clear and present threats of both foreign and domestic terrorism to responding to cyber attacks on our critical infrastructure, to helping distribute relief and assistance in the face of natural disasters, there is no shortage of work to be done by that Agency and the men and women who work there every single day.

I often say that leadership is the most important ingredient to the success of almost any organization on this planet. In sports, in business, in government, our leaders set the tone at the top. They lead by their example, and they are the ones who guide their team to accomplish its mission, or, in the case of the Department of Homeland Security, its many missions. That is why it is crucial that the Department of Homeland Security have Senate-confirmed, qualified leadership at its helm.

After years in multiple administrations leaving key Senate-confirmed posts vacant or held on an "Acting" capacity for far too long, this Department needs qualified leaders now more than ever.

It has been without a Senate-confirmed Deputy Secretary for over 3 years. Let me repeat that. This vital Agency has been without a Senate-confirmed Deputy Secretary for more than 3 years. That has to change. With the confirmation of COL John Tien to serve, this body can do something about it, and we can do it today.

The responsibilities of the Deputy Secretary are daunting. Serving as a chief operating officer, the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security is responsible for the day-to-day business of the Agency and the management of its operations and 250,000 men and women.

Colonel Tien is a proven leader and dedicated public servant. He is a retired U.S. Army colonel, whose 24-year career includes three combat tours in Iraq and national security roles in the Clinton, the George W. Bush, and the Obama White Houses. He has worked hand in glove with people from different perspectives and commands the respect of Republicans and Democrats alike.

For the past decade, COL Tien has been a leader in the private sector, where he has held senior executive roles in our Nation's financial sector and managed complex organizations and operations.

His nomination has drawn bipartisan support. Dozens of national security leaders and experts, including several former military and civilian government officials who served under Democratic and Republican Presidents, have expressed their strong support for Colonel Tien's nomination.

Just a week ago, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, on which I serve, advanced his

nomination by a wide margin—by a wide margin, bipartisan support. Given Colonel Tien's past leadership experiences, I am hopeful that the Department will finally get the Senate-confirmed leader it needs and deserves in this critical post.

The American people are counting on seasoned leadership at the Department of Homeland Security after too many years of vacancies. I describe those vacancies as Swiss cheese, executive branch Swiss cheese, and that needs to end.

I applaud President Biden for nominating Colonel Tien. I encourage my colleagues to confirm him.

Let me say on a personal note to Colonel Tien and his wife Tracy—and they have a couple of daughters, Amanda and Rebecca—when you serve, as he did in the military for 24 years, rising to the rank of colonel, you don't just serve that as an individual. It is not just the officer or enlisted person who is serving. If they have a family—and we almost all do—the family serves as well. If they have a spouse, they have children, they serve as well. And we don't often acknowledge that, not often enough, at least.

I just want to take a moment to say to Colonel Tien's wife Tracy, to their daughters, Amanda and Rebecca, we are grateful for your service as well. And we are honored and privileged that you would share a good man in this new role for our country.

And to Colonel Tien, whose mother recently passed away, I understand, just a few months ago, from COVID-19, let me say that I know your mom must be looking down from on high today and feeling very proud of her son on this day and every day.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CENSORSHIP

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, at the end of May, Facebook announced that it would no longer censor claims that the coronavirus was man-made. The mainstream media, which had savaged the story during the previous administration, suddenly started backpedaling, and the Biden White House, which had reportedly canceled the previous administration's investigation into whether the novel coronavirus originated in a Wuhan lab, announced a 90-day inquiry into the virus's origins.

The occasion for all this backpedaling was apparently a report in the Wall Street Journal that three researchers who worked at Wuhan Institute of Virology "sought hospital care" in late 2019 for symptoms consistent with the coronavirus. In the wake of

that report, it became impossible for the President or the mainstream media or Facebook to deny what had always been a plausible theory: that the virus came from the virology lab in Wuhan.

Journalists moved to explain their previous rejection of this theory, and some of them openly admitted what had been obvious: that they rejected the theory not because of flaws in the theory itself but because of those who had advanced this hypothesis.

We don't know what these revived investigations will ultimately show, but the Wuhan reversal illustrates multiple issues. One, of course, is the need to remember that our social media experience is heavily curated. The posts and ads we see are selected for us by complex algorithms that analyze the data social media companies have collected on each of us and curate our experience accordingly.

On top of that, as the past year or two has illustrated, social media companies actively censor certain material, meaning that there are posts we will never see.

As chairman and now ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee's Communications and Tech Subcommittee, I have pushed for transparency requirements for social media companies, and I have introduced two bipartisan bills that would increase internet transparency while preserving the light-touch approach to regulation that has allowed the internet to flourish.

My Filter Bubble Transparency Act would allow social media users to opt out of the filter bubble—in other words, to opt out of the filtered experience tailored for them by opaque algorithms—and instead see an unfiltered social media feed or search results.

The Platform Accountability and Transparency Act, which I introduced with Senator SCHATZ, would increase transparency and accountability around content moderation. Sites would be required to provide an easily digestible disclosure of their content moderation practices for users, and, importantly, they would be required to explain their decisions to remove material to consumers.

Under the PACT Act, if a site chose to remove your post, it would have to tell you why it decided to remove your post. The PACT Act would also require sites to have an appeals process. So if Facebook, for example, removed one of your posts, it would not only have to tell you why, but it would have to provide a way for you to appeal that decision.

Let me be clear. Private entities are free to have their own opinions and viewpoints and should not be compelled by the government to publish alternative views, but that is not what we are talking about with these large social media platforms. Most strongly deny that they are publishers and instead hold themselves forth as neutral platforms for the free exchange of ideas from all corners. That is the promise they make to consumers.

The Wuhan reversal is more than a reminder that our social media experience is actually a heavily curated one. It also raises serious questions about censorship and the maintenance of the marketplace of ideas that is a hallmark of a free society. There is no free society without the free exchange of ideas. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom to speak in the public square—all of these are essential elements of a free society. The more a government or other entities crack down on freedom of speech and the free exchange of ideas, the more we move away from a free society and toward tyranny.

I say "or other entities" because the responsibility for protecting the free exchange of ideas extends beyond the government. Government, of course, has an absolute obligation to defend our fundamental freedoms, but other institutions in society also have a role. You can't have a free society without free institutions. I am thinking here particularly of the press, universities, and in this day and age, social media companies.

If the press or social media companies only sanction one narrative—the narrative preferred by the government or by social elites or by any other group—the marketplace of ideas shrinks substantially. If multiple groups that should be fostering the free exchange of ideas combine to limit or advance a particular narrative, they start to control public opinion instead of allowing individuals to form their own opinions based on a free flow of information.

Unfortunately, as the Wuhan story illustrates, today we are seeing a real movement to restrict the free flow of ideas. Whether we are talking about speech codes or social media censorship, more and more, we are seeing a preferred narrative being advanced and opinions outside of that preferred narrative being censored or marginalized.

We see it in government with bills like S. 1, which would, among other things, allow the IRS to consider an organization's views before deciding whether or not to grant it tax-exempt status, or the Equality Act, which would crack down on freedom of speech and freedom of religion in unprecedented ways. We see it outside government when media outlets engage in selective reporting to highlight an accepted narrative instead of reporting the news and the facts, whatever they are, or when social media censors legitimate theories or stories or when universities crack down on free speech.

In the wake of the Wuhan lab story, we saw widespread censorship across government, social media, and the press for political reasons. President Biden seemingly shut down the former President's investigation into the virus's origin because it was the former President's investigation. Democrats in Congress pressured social media companies to censor information that contradicted the narrative that they

were embracing. The mainstream media savaged the lab origin story. Social media sites censored it. And all of this happened because of the political affiliation of the people advancing this reasonable hypothesis.

You can only have a marketplace of ideas if ideas actually get out there, which is why censorship, as I have said, is antithetical to a free society. It is also important to note—and this is a critical, critical point—that having a free marketplace of ideas means allowing some ideas that might be wrong, that might seem offensive, that might seem silly. We are not talking about content that, for example, promotes violence but ideas that are provocative, debatable, or out of the mainstream. The alternative is allowing the government or some other entity to decide what information we see and what we believe.

It is important to remember that sometimes ideas that seem silly or wrong initially turn out to be right. More than one widely accepted scientific theory started out as a fringe position. A prevailing opinion may turn out to be wrong, and political or social power doesn't necessarily equal truth.

I hope that their abrupt reversal on COVID's possible origins makes media organizations and social media platforms think twice the next time they consider censoring a story. I hope it reminds them of the dangers of restricting the free flow of ideas and of their obligation to separate their politics from their jobs.

In a speech he delivered in 1967, Ronald Reagan, marveling at our government by the people, said this:

Perhaps you and I have lived too long with this miracle to properly be appreciative. Freedom is a fragile thing, and it's never more than one generation away from extinction. It is not ours by way of inheritance; it must be fought for and defended constantly by each generation, for it comes only once to a people.

I fear that long acquaintance with the blessings of liberty—with the blessings of a free press and freedom of speech and freedom of religion—has sometimes made us careless about the preservation of these freedoms. We are used to them, and we assume that they will always be with us. But, as Ronald Reagan pointed out, freedom has to be actively safeguarded, or it will be lost.

I have seen too many instances lately where our cherished First Amendment freedoms are subordinated to a political and social agenda, and I hope, I hope that the Wuhan story reminds us of the responsibility that each one of us has to safeguard these freedoms, lest they slip away from us.

BROADBAND

Mr. President, on Tuesday, the Commerce subcommittee of which I am the ranking member, the Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband, will hold a hearing on building resilient broadband networks. My hope is that this hearing will help

inform discussions of broadband funding in any infrastructure legislation.

I am particularly looking forward to hearing from Denny Law, the CEO of Golden West Telecommunications in South Dakota, who will speak on the challenges of deploying reliable and resilient broadband in rural areas.

The pandemic provided the most significant test to date of the resiliency of our broadband networks. Overnight, quite literally, our networks faced huge new demands. As the Nation locked down, demand for broadband shot up. Our phones and tablets and laptops became our main way of communicating with friends and family and, for many of us, our main way of doing our jobs. Video conferencing exploded—staff meetings, strategy meetings, virtual happy hours, telemedicine.

How did our networks stand up to the demand? Well, they exceeded expectations and vindicated the light-touch regulatory approach of the United States to broadband policy. While networks in Europe and elsewhere slowed streaming speeds in order to keep their networks up and running, U.S. networks maintained both their speed and quality. It was a real American success story.

The success of American networks during the pandemic was the result of sustained investment by U.S. telecommunications companies, which have made network reliability a priority. Congress should continue to encourage this kind of private investment and maintain a regulatory regime that allows companies to make the kinds of choices and investments that have resulted in strong and resilient U.S. networks.

Going forward, one of our priorities here in Congress has to be supporting the continued development of 5G. U.S. companies are already building out 5G networks, but there is more work to be done. We need to remove regulatory and permitting hurdles to deployment and ensure that companies have access to the spectrum they need to build strong networks.

Increasing spectrum availability will spur 5G deployments, and we need to build on previous efforts to make spectrum available, like my MOBILE NOW Act, legislation that we passed a few years ago. I have also repeatedly introduced legislation called the STREAMLINE Small Cell Deployment Act to address another key part of the 5G equation, and that is infrastructure.

Mr. President, 5G technology requires not just traditional cell phone towers but small antennas called “small cells” that can often be attached to existing infrastructure, like utility poles or buildings. The Federal Communications Commission, under Chairman Pai, modernized its regulations for the approval of small cells, but more work can be done to expedite small cell deployment.

The STREAMLINE Act focuses on updating current law to better reflect

emerging technology and to speed up permitting while respecting the role of State and local governments in making deployment decisions.

Adequate spectrum and the ability to efficiently deploy infrastructure are essential for building out strong U.S. 5G networks. But there is another key part of the equation, and that is having a sufficient workforce to meet the demands of 5G deployment and, later, 5G maintenance. That is why I have introduced the Telecommunications Skilled Workforce Act. My bill would help increase the number of workers enrolled in 5G training programs and identify ways to grow the telecommunications workforce to meet the demands of 5G.

As the resident of a rural State, expanding broadband access in rural areas has long been a priority of mine here in the U.S. Senate. We have made a lot of progress in recent years, but there is more work to be done.

I recently introduced the Rural Connectivity Advancement Program Act, along with Senators HASSAN, MORAN, and CORTEZ MASTO. Our legislation would set aside proceeds from spectrum auctions conducted by the FCC to build out broadband in unserved areas. It is essential that we expedite the deployment of fixed broadband in rural areas because this technology is necessary groundwork for 5G deployment. Without reliable broadband, rural areas will be excluded from access to 5G.

Reliable, fast internet is an essential element of our Nation's infrastructure. Like roads and bridges and railways and airports, strong internet networks keep our economy strong, and any infrastructure package should make an investment in broadband and 5G, as well as including regulatory relief, like that in my STREAMLINE Act, to expedite 5G deployment. However, we need to make sure that any Federal money is allocated in the most efficient manner possible and distributed responsibly, with coordination by expert Agencies like the Federal Communications Commission, to prevent waste.

We don't want another situation like what happened in the wake of the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which provided more than \$7 billion to multiple Agencies for rural broadband deployment, a majority of which was wasted, resulting in just a fraction of the access that was promised.

I am looking forward to Tuesday's hearing, and I will continue to work to advance nationwide 5G deployment and ensure that our rural communities receive the full benefits of the 5G revolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1652

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the city of Chicago, which I am proud to represent, there is an organization called Life Span. This is an incredible group of people who dedicate their

lives to providing comprehensive services for the survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Every day they respond to horrifying cases of abuse. They help thousands of women and children access the support they need to address trauma and to rebuild their lives.

For example, Life Span recently assisted a woman after her teenage daughter was sexually assaulted by the woman's husband. Life Span was able to help the mother and daughter navigate the overwhelming challenges of pursuing justice against the abuser and offer support to the daughter throughout this horrible process.

When the mother pursued a divorce from the abuser, Life Span filed a petition and is representing the mother as she navigates issues of child support and allocation of custody.

The three Life Span staffers that the mother and daughter have interacted with all provided critical bilingual and bicultural support. They have provided this crucial service for this family during an incredibly traumatic experience. And all three of these staffers are funded by assistance provided through the Victims of Crime Act, or VOCA. Life Span told me that without VOCA funding, "none of these personnel . . . would be able to have done this job."

Congress passed the Victims of Crime Act in 1984 to establish the Crime Victims Fund. This fund provides grants to State victim compensation and assistance programs, which assist victims with expenses like medical bills, funeral expenses, and the loss of wages during recovery.

How often I have heard Members of Congress come to the floor and in committee speak about the plight of the victims of crime. This is an effort—an overt effort by Congress—to make sure that we are there when they desperately need us.

The fund also provides funds to thousands of victims service providers, like Life Span, across the Nation. These providers offer programs serving victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, trafficking, and drunk driving.

The Crime Victims Fund doesn't receive a dime of taxpayer dollars. How about that? It is funded through criminal fines, penalties, forfeited bail bonds, and special assessments collected by the Federal Government.

Historically, most of the money in the fund comes from those criminal fines. But in recent years, deposits into the fund have dropped significantly, as the Justice Department began relying more on deferred prosecutions and non-prosecution agreements.

Monetary penalties from these deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements are currently deposited into the general Treasury instead of this fund, and, as a result, this shift has had a devastating impact on the fund and the services available to crime victims in America.

That is why a bipartisan, bicameral coalition of Members of Congress

worked with the advocacy organizations on a fix to the VOCA law to sustain the Crime Victims Fund.

Our bill would stabilize the depleted fund by redirecting monetary penalties from deferred prosecutions and non-prosecution agreements to the victims and service providers that desperately need help.

The reduced deposits into the fund have already had a devastating impact. Victim assistance grants have been reduced by more than \$600 million in 2021, and more cuts are looming if we don't do something.

The executive director of Life Span in Chicago told me that VOCA funds 44 percent of the agency's services—about \$1.6 million annually. A substantial loss in VOCA funds would mean that they would have to cut back staff who provide legal services, affecting an estimated 880 clients.

Life Span is not alone. Advocates across the State of Illinois and across the country have reached out and shared what these cuts would mean for their agencies and the victims they serve.

The Center for Prevention of Abuse in Peoria, IL, noted:

We never want to be in a position where we are made to turn away people who need [our] specialized services and whole-hearted, dedicated care. Our teams are already stretched thin as they live the promise of our mission day in and day out. Fewer VOCA dollars means less staff and a lessened ability to help those who need to find safety, food, shelter, empowerment, freedom, and peace.

There is no time to waste. Every day that goes by, we miss an opportunity to help replenish this fund. In 2021, the fund has already missed out on approximately \$400 million in deposits. We are not even halfway through the year. Imagine how much more money the fund may lose if we don't do something.

That is why it is imperative that the Senate immediately pass this bill. The House already did it in March, with broad bipartisan support, and here in the Senate we have a bipartisan coalition of 56 Senators—36 Democrats and 20 Republicans—cosponsoring the legislation. We could send this bill to the President's desk today. We should have sent it to him weeks ago. Unfortunately, there is an objection that has prevented us from moving forward.

In a recent letter to Leader SCHUMER, victims' rights and law enforcement organizations said that, "The objectors are, in effect, holding victim services hostage in an ideological quest to overhaul the Appropriations process by eliminating budgetary offsets."

What a target to choose if you want to change the procedure of the committee—crime victims?

I agree with the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence and so many other groups. More than 1,700 that are begging us to do something and stop holding this critical legislation.

The passage of this legislation today would ensure that victims are able to

maintain these critical services. Don't we owe it to them after the promise of help to come through?

At this point, I would like to turn to my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI.

And I ask unanimous consent that Senators MURKOWSKI, TOOMEY, and I be able to complete our remarks prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge and thank my colleague and friend from Illinois for his leadership on this issue. He has outlined well the situation in front of us with regard to the status of the Crime Victims Fund.

Again, this is a nontaxpayer source of funding, which is designed to help the millions of victims of crimes—those who have been violated, those who are extraordinarily vulnerable. And we are at a place where, as he has indicated, we have a proposal here that could help address how this fund is replenished to, again, ensure that those who have been made victims can receive some level of compensation.

We are kind of stuck here this morning, which is extraordinarily unfortunate. Folks back home in Alaska are just starting their day, and they are looking with anticipation and hope and, quite honestly, prayers that today might be the day that they get good news on this.

Right now, I have about 30 organizations in Alaska, including our domestic violence shelters, our child advocacy centers, our victim advocacy organizations—they have all been notified that they are going to expect a 35-percent cut to their funding, effective the 1st of July, so just in a couple of weeks here.

And because of this broken VOCA deposit issue, this cut is set to affect their funds for not only this year but for next year going forward.

So think about it. You are the shelter in Kodiak, where I was just 6, 8 weeks or so ago. When you are told you have a 35-percent cut to your budget coming and you have a small community, where are you going to find those resources? Because, believe you, me, the individuals who still require those services are not staying at home and saying: Well, I guess we didn't have the services here on this big island of Kodiak; so I am just going to stay put.

The need is still there. In fact, the need is more enhanced or exacerbated than ever before. We have seen this as a follow-on from COVID. We have seen those aftereffects, that aftershock, when you have been in an isolated situation where you have been forced to kind of shelter in place, if you will, but your home is not a safe shelter. It is not a shelter in that sense of the word. But you don't have services. And so where do you go? You stay with your abuser. You stay in the situation that is unsound, unsafe, because you don't have anyplace to turn. So the need out there is considerable.

We had a situation last summer of devastating loss, with five village residents in different villages who had died in domestic violence murders over a course of 10 days. These are small villages where everybody knows everybody, and the loss of one person—an elder, a child, or a victim—is extraordinary. And so we looked at that, and we said: Well, that is exacerbated by COVID and what has happened.

But, no, this has been a situation for us long prior to COVID, in terms of, unfortunately, the levels that we see of domestic violence, sexual assault, the victimization that we see—so being there to provide funding for services to help prevent these deaths, the trauma that children experience when they are in the room, the murders that affect families for generations. There is a story in the news just today—a domestic situation, the husband and the wife. The husband took the wife's life and then took his own, and it was a 6-year-old with an iPad who notified the authorities.

I think about the reality of what a 35-percent cut means, what it means when you say your service providers are faced with \$6 million less in funding for victims services. The shelters are calling out to us for help. One domestic violence shelter in the State is facing the reality of laying off six full-time jobs within their organization. This is unacceptable.

I understand that there are concerns. Senator TOOMEY is going to speak to them. But this legislation doesn't change how Federal tax money is spent. It provides a technical fix by directing additional nontaxpayer dollars from criminal monetary penalties into this fund. So we are sitting at a point where the longer that Congress delays this fix, the larger the cuts that victims services in my State and all around the country will face.

This has been a hard time for us, and I think we recognize it, but for those who are trying to serve victims, for those who are trying to serve the most vulnerable at an exceptionally vulnerable time in their lives, it makes it 10 times harder. Our providers are exhausted, they are burned out, and now they are faced with massive cuts. We simply cannot fail them.

I would urge us to look past the politics on this. This is what these victims' advocates are saying: Please don't use us as the political lever here. So I join not only with Senator DURBIN but with the many in this body who would urge that we pass this technical fix to VOCA.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Alaska for her heartfelt remarks.

There are innocent people who are victims of domestic violence whose fate depends on what we do right here and now. This is an important budgetary debate that the Senator from Pennsylvania is raising. I ask, please don't use these people in this desperate situation as a pressure point. Let's try

to reconcile this on a rational basis without jeopardizing them.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1652, which was received from the House and is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, let me say I think I agree with 98, 99 percent of what I just heard from my colleagues.

In the 11 years I have been in the Senate, I have lost track of how many rape crisis centers and how many child advocacy centers I have visited. They have expanded the number, fortunately, because they have gotten additional resources from Congress. They do some of the most important work I know of—incredibly painful work—in helping a child through an appalling, traumatic experience when there is a law enforcement need to get information that can further traumatize a child. I mean, the work these folks do is amazing, it is essential, and the Senator from Alaska is exactly right in that there is a real need here.

The good news is that there is a real, very clear, and easy path forward here. The legislation that the Senator from Illinois is proposing creates a new source of money for the Crime Victims Fund. It is a new category, it is substantial, and it is going to be new resources for the advocates for crime victims to better be able to continue to do their very, very important work, and I fully support that.

So where do we disagree? Here is where we disagree: The legislation does require a lot of money—new money—to go into the Crime Victims Fund. The Senator from Illinois is exactly correct in that it is not taxpayer money; it is money from the settlements for criminal and civil penalties. I fully support that. What their legislation doesn't do, however, is require a dime of that money to actually get to the advocates of crime. It is very nice to put a lot of money into an account that has a name on it that is the Crime Victims Fund. That is very nice, and I support that, but I would like to take one more step and make sure the money actually gets to the victims of crime and their advocates.

Now, there is a little bit of budgetary information that explains why, if we don't adopt my approach here, this money will not get to the victims of crime and their advocates. You see, the appropriations process, the spending process around here, always operates under some limit. It could be a statutory limit or a limit passed by a budget resolution, but there is a limit. There is no limit as to how much people want to spend around here, but there is a limit as to how much they actually can.

We have a very perverse budgetary rule, and that rule says that, in any given year, if there is money in this Crime Victims Fund—mind you, not tax dollars, but if there is money in it—and Congress doesn't give it to the crime victims as it is supposed to, you can pretend that it is a savings, and it allows you to spend more than you would otherwise be able to spend on any number of other things, on anything—tanks, buildings, roads, whatever. That is the dynamic. That is what happens here. It actually creates an incentive, however perverse this is, for Congress not to allocate this money to the victims of crime and to their advocates. By not doing so, they get to claim a savings which isn't real—but that is the way the budget rules work—and spend that money elsewhere.

Now, you might say: Well, who would do a thing like that? Oh. Ha. Well, it used to happen all the time. In 2014, there was \$9 billion available in the Crime Victims Fund, but in order to spend more money elsewhere, less than \$1 billion was actually allocated to victims of crime and their advocates, so they got \$8 billion of difference that they could spend on whatever else they wanted, and they did. In 2013, it was the same story.

This was going on routinely until 2015 when I and some of my colleagues said: Wait a minute. This isn't right. This money is supposed to be going to crime victims, and it is not.

That is the first and most objectionable problem. It is also dishonest because there is no savings of taxpayer money here; this is just not giving crime victims the money from criminals that they are supposed to get. It is outrageous.

For a while, we got some cooperation, and they did less of this. In other words, more of the money that was supposed to go to crime victims for a while did, in fact, go there. But I am very concerned—and I have been concerned since 2015—that, at any point in time, we will go back to this process. So I introduced legislation called the Fairness for Crime Victims Act. I introduced it in 2015. What it does is it just requires that the money going into the fund actually go to the victims of crime and their advocates, and there are various mechanisms for doing it. The bill was reported out of the Senate Budget Committee in 2015, and it was unanimously adopted by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019.

I have been working as closely as I can with the appropriators to address this so that we will actually send to crime victims the money that is supposed to go to them. Since 2000, over \$82 billion of money has not been allocated to crime victims, as it should have been, precisely because of this mechanism.

Some might say: Well, hasn't it gotten better? Yes. The answer is that it has. But how do I know it is going to get worse? How do I know we are going to go right back to this? I will tell you

how I know. All I have to do is read the President's budget.

President Biden's budget, if you look at table S-8, explicitly calls for withholding money from victims of crime and advocates for those victims from the Crime Victims Fund and also the Children's Health Insurance Program so as to spend more money in other areas. It is right here: "changes in mandatory program offsets: \$26 billion." It says the limitation enacted will come from the Crime Victims Fund program and cancellations in the Children's Health Insurance Program. This is not like wild speculation; this is President Biden's budget, saying: Oh, here is what I want to spend, and part of how I will spend it—part of how we will get there—is by withholding money that should be going to victims of crime.

So I am fully in support of this new allocation of money into the account, but money in the account doesn't solve the problem. We need one more step, that is all—the step that says we are actually going to send it to victims of crime instead of whatever spending people in this town decide they prefer. That is what this is about. That is what the difference is.

We have developed a process. We have worked with people on both sides of the aisle, and we have passed legislation in committee to do it. We want to simply require the money that is meant for victims of crime and their advocates to get to them, and we are being told it won't all get to them under the status quo.

There is a simple solution here. There is a simple path forward. I think there is a genuine, sincere agreement, among everybody who has spoken, about the need for this service. All I am asking is that we actually have a mechanism to get them the money rather than to do what we all know is coming: Pretend they are going to get all of this money when, in fact, it is going to be diverted to other purposes.

Therefore, I ask that the Senator modify his request to include my amendment, which is at the desk; that it be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the modification?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I am disappointed that the Senator from Pennsylvania is adamant in his position, even though we are dealing with victims of crime, victims of domestic violence, and victims of child abuse. Like Illinois, Pennsylvania has experienced a nearly 70-percent cut in VOCA funding since 2018, and more cuts are on the horizon because of his strategy.

Here is what it boils down to: If you listen carefully to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, he is not suggesting that the money is being

spent for other purposes but is suggesting that it could be. In fact, there is a conscious effort by the Appropriations subcommittee to make sure, if all of the money is not spent in 1 year, that enough will be maintained to stabilize the fund for future years. That is thoughtful, and that is what we like to hear, but we are in a desperate moment now wherein we need the money and need it at this moment.

I understand my colleague's concern about the scorekeeping in the budget. It is an important issue, even though it is esoteric. But to do it in relation to the Crime Victims Fund seems entirely misplaced. While this adjustment does not, in fact, transfer money from the fund to other priorities, it is just a budgeting gimmick that he is suggesting.

This is not the right place or time to do this when thousands of people across the United States are in desperate need of shelter to get out of an abusive home; of help for their children who have witnessed murders; and of dealing with court proceedings that may be unintelligible to the average person to try to protect their families and themselves. To think that we are engaged in this high-level budget debate at this moment at their expense is just not right.

I urge my colleague to withdraw his amendment and allow the legislation to proceed. We can debate the budget within the budget resolution and the appropriations process but not at the expense of crime victims across America. If he will not withdraw his amendment, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I will just say briefly that, clearly and certainly, this is not a scorekeeping debate, and this is not about budgets. This is about whether victims of crime and their advocates will actually get the money that we say they are going to get. It is not about what could be; it is about what has been. This money was routinely raided for other purposes until we brought a stop to it recently, and it is about what will be because the Biden administration is telling us it intends to do this.

In order to ensure that crime victims and their advocates actually get the money that we say they are going to get, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VOTE ON BEAUDREAU NOMINATION

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Beaudreau nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Baldwin	Grassley	Portman
Barrasso	Hagerty	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Sinema
Casey	Lankford	Smith
Cassidy	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Lujan	Tester
Coons	Lummis	Thune
Cornyn	Manchin	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Markey	Toomey
Cotton	Marshall	Van Hollen
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Warnock
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Fischer	Murray	Young
Gillibrand	Ossoff	
Graham	Padilla	

NAYS—9

Cruz	Lee	Shelby
Hawley	Paul	Sullivan
Kennedy	Sanders	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Cramer	Peters
--------	--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 157, John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Ben Ray Lujan, Michael F. Bennet, Jeanne Shaheen, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher A. Coons, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Merkley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Heinrich	Romney
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt	Johnson	Rubio
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Scott (SC)
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Lujan	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cornyn	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Duckworth	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warnock
Fischer	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Graham	Portman	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	Young

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Grassley	McConnell
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Booker	Moran
Cramer	Peters

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks prior to the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise again to call for this entire body to vote and consider the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Preven-

tion Act. This commonsense reform would ensure that people in the U.S. military who have been subjected to sexual assault and other serious crimes get the justice that they deserve.

I began calling for the full floor vote on this bill on May 24. That was 24 days ago. Since then, an estimated 1,344 servicemembers will have been raped or sexually assaulted. Two in three of those survivors will not even report it because they know that they are more likely to face retaliation than receive justice.

This is a scourge that we have been looking at for over 8 years. We have passed nearly 250 measures to address sexual assault in the military, to address retaliation, to address prevention, and none of them have dented the numbers. In fact, our estimated cases are at about 20,000 cases, and among those, only about 200 have gone to courts-martial and ended in conviction. It is not enough. We aren't moving the numbers in the right direction. They are, in fact, going in the wrong direction.

We also have a reform that we have looked at for 8 years. It creates a bright line at all serious crimes to handle two issues: one, the bias we see in sexual assault in the military; that if you are a servicemember who reports sexual assault, it is unlikely that you will get justice, and it is likely that you will be retaliated against.

And after we have made retaliation a crime three times in a row, we have only seen one court-martial for retaliation. That is outrageous.

And so now is the time that we bring this measure to the floor. It does not cost a lot of money. It is something that uses the existing infrastructure, the existing lawyers, the existing infrastructure around the lawyers.

Two, it does not take a long time to implement because, in fact, after the military police complete their investigation and have their recommendation, basically, they send that recommendation to the prosecutor, as opposed to the commander. So after the review by the prosecutor, it goes right back to the commander if that prosecutor declines to prosecute.

So, ultimately, it changes the system in a very small but powerful way, and the reason why this change is recommended by all military experts is three reasons: One, the bright line creates a justice system for all plaintiffs and all defendants. And since we have bias with regard to women in the military and we have bias with regard to Black and Brown servicemembers, this change will remove bias and professionalize the system for everyone.

Second, our allies have done this. Our allies have done it—UK, Israel, Germany, Australia, Netherlands. They have done it over the last 40 years for defendants' rights, to make sure we have a system that is fair to everyone. When they put this change in place, they reported to our panel that, No. 1, they saw no diminution in command

control; and, No. 2, they saw no undermining of good order and discipline. So for those reasons, that is why we need to pursue this legislation, a bright line.

And then, last is the question that the chairman always raises, that this must go through the committee. The committee has been looking at this for 8 years. We have had multiple hearings on this topic. We have had the data. We have talked about it with every service Secretary for the last decade I have been on the committee. We have talked about it with each of the services for the last decade that I have been on the committee, and we have tried to get a vote on this measure, unsuccessfully, for the past 5 years. We have been denied a vote every time in the last 5 years.

So to say now that only the committee can have jurisdiction is not true. They have had their chance, and they have passed close to 250 measures. Those measures have not moved the needle. Those measures are ones that the DOD was comfortable with. They have never wanted this measure. Now we have agreement by the chairman, by this panel, by many of the service Secretaries that, OK, fine, we are with you; we will take sexual assault out of the chain of command.

While that is good, it is not enough because it will create two systems of justice, and you should not privilege just one set of plaintiffs to have a positive, professional, unbiased system.

And given all of the data we have about race and bias against Black servicemembers and Brown servicemembers being punished up to 2.5 times more than White servicemembers, you need to fix the system for everybody.

So back to the argument of our allies, that is why they did their bright line at serious crimes—the equivalent of felonies—so that they could have a justice system that is worthy of the sacrifices that the men and women in our armed services make.

So I ask once again that we can have a vote on this floor. We now have 66 cosponsors of this legislation, widely bipartisan. How many bills in this Chamber are supported by LIZ WARREN and TED CRUZ at the same time? How many pieces of legislation have been voted on by both CHUCK SCHUMER and MITCH MCCONNELL? Very few. But the reason we have such bipartisan support is we have two female command veterans in this body. One is a Republican, JONI ERNST. One is a Democrat, TAMMY DUCKWORTH. They are both on this legislation. They have served as commanders, and they understand the importance of the commander's roles. But they also have seen that nothing has gotten better. They saw the report from Fort Hood that said the command climate was so toxic that it was permissible for sexual assault and sexual harassment. And so they have said enough is enough.

And so when you have so many former commanders and sexual assault survivors from this Chamber supporting this legislation, it is time that

it does not need to go through the committee. More than half of our committee supports this. But when we take issues like this to the committee, they have been taken out in conference.

Despite winning the vote in the Senate, despite winning the vote in the House, our bill in 2019 to make sure that a servicemember could come forward and not be prosecuted for minor related offenses, like drinking or being off base—that bill passed in the Senate, passed in the House, and was taken out in conference because the DOD didn't like it.

So I promise you, if we pass this bill in our committee, in the House and the Senate—I promise you—it would be narrowed just down to sexual assault because that is what the DOD will agree to.

I am tired of doing only what the DOD will agree to. It is not our job to defer to the DOD. It is our job as U.S. Senators to provide oversight and accountability over the administration and over the entire Department of Defense.

When we abdicate that responsibility, what we have is what we had for the last 10 years, failure—failure in the committee because we only put forward items the DOD was comfortable with.

I just don't know how much longer we want survivors to have to wait. We have considered this legislation together. We have, every year, sat down, discussed it—pros, cons. Are other reforms working?

I have done that with every one of the 100 Senators in this Chamber every year for the last 10 years. It has been intensely considered, and I spend an extra amount of time with committee members because they are interested.

So this is not new. It doesn't need to go through the committee. We have been denied a vote and filibustered a vote for 8 years and denied a vote for the last 5 years. So I don't know why the committee gets sole jurisdiction. I don't understand.

And, again, how many measures does this Chamber have that have 66 cosponsors?

It is also a generational shift. And when you have something of such import, it comes to the floor. We repealed don't ask, don't tell on the floor. We had two floor votes. The majority leader at the time gave us those votes, and it passed on the floor. It did not go through the committee.

It is time to bring a justice system that is worthy of the sacrifice that the men and women make every day. And you need to have that bright line so it is a justice system that works for women and servicemembers of color because right now we have data and evidence that there is bias against those individuals.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Committee

on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Is there objection?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, once again, I object to the request from the Senator from New York for the reasons I previously stated. I will repeat again: I support removing prosecution of sexual assault and related crimes from the chain of command, but we must take care that we do it thoughtfully, in a manner that does not stress the military justice system or distort it in a way that would affect the efficiency and operation of the military. The best way to do that, in my view, is to consider these matters in the context of the annual Defense bill, which we will be marking up in a month.

Mr. President, I would also point out that this week, Jeh Johnson, who served under President Obama as the Department of Defense general counsel, and then Secretary of Homeland Security, wrote an article addressing the scope of Senator GILLIBRAND's bill, urging caution that we focus on legislative solutions tailored to address the problem we are trying to solve. And to remind my colleagues, as the DOD general counsel, Secretary Johnson oversaw all legal services performed within the Department of Defense. He advised the Secretary and all government officials on military justice matters and oversaw the annual review of the Manual for Courts-Martial. He is an informed and expert voice on these matters.

During his tenure as DOD general counsel, he was no stranger to momentous change, leading the implementation of the repeal of don't ask, don't tell. As he states in his article, he has long supported moving charging decisions over sex offenses out of the chain of command.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From LAWFARE, June 16, 2021]

THE MILITARY JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT AND INCREASING PREVENTION ACT: ARE THE SOLUTIONS COMMENSURATE WITH THE PROBLEM?

(By Jeh Johnson)

The Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act of 2021 is legislation pending in Congress to reshape the manner in which the U.S. military prosecutes sexual assault within its ranks. This is reform that is much needed and long overdue. Notably, however, the bill in its current form reshapes military justice far beyond the context of sexual assault. Congress should take care to fashion a solution commensurate with the problem at hand, and not go too far.

Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY), the principal sponsor of the bill, S. 1520, deserves

credit for her heroic and persistent campaign over the years to highlight the problem of sexual assault in the military. Few others in Congress today could have assembled such a broad bipartisan coalition of 64 co-sponsors behind such an important, substantive piece of legislation, while moving (or, to put it more appropriately, dragging) the top brass at the Pentagon to the same place. From my experience 10 years ago preparing the military for the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, I know how resistant to change that community can be.

I support Senator Gillibrand's effort to move charging decisions for sex offenses in the military to an independent, trained group of military lawyers. I said as much publicly in 2013. Likewise, almost all retired general and flag officers I speak with today agree that the male-dominated chain of command has failed the victims of sexual assault in the military. They accept the need for change.

But, in its current form, the changes contemplated by S. 1520 are not limited to sex-related offenses. The bill would create an independent body of lawyers, outside the chain of command, to make charging decisions for a broad range of offenses punishable by more than a year's confinement. These include murder, manslaughter, child endangerment, larceny, robbery, fraudulent use of a credit card, kidnapping, arson, housebreaking, extortion, bribery, perjury, subornation of perjury and obstruction of justice. (Notably, other offenses such as receipt of stolen property, forgery and conduct unbecoming an officer are excluded from the bill's reach, but the logic for the distinction is unclear.) In all, if enacted, the legislation would constitute the largest change to military justice since the enactment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice in 1950.

Why are offenses ranging from murder, arson to perjury included in the bill's reach? What is the justification for so large an overhaul? Where is the congressional finding that, when it comes to the broader range of offenses, the chain of command in the U.S. military has failed in its duty to carry out military justice?

Supporters of the bill argue that, once Congress goes down the road of creating an independent body to make charging decisions for sex crimes, it cannot stop; that to limit the creation of an independent body for sex crimes would also create the stigma of "pink courts" that appear to exist for the benefit of women. In my view, the exception is warranted, perceptions can be addressed, and the exception should not swallow the rule. In both civilian and military life, the reality is the sex offenses are different, in the manner in which they are reported, investigated, and prosecuted. It should also be noted that victims of sexual assault are both men and women.

Here are several other considerations:

First, as written the bill appears to require a whole new bureaucracy to implement and execute the changes contemplated. No one should be under the illusion that the broad mission contemplated by the bill can be carried by a small band of elite JAGs in a suite someplace in northern Virginia. The bill would require that an independent group of lawyers make charging decisions for a vast range

Mr. REED. I think given the wise comments of not only Mr. JOHNSON but also the pending recommendations by the Department of Defense concerning this issue, again, the best place to have a thorough, lively debate and amendments, by the way, which are precluded in this unanimous consent, would be in the Armed Services Committee in the

context of the annual defense authorization bill. That is where we have confronted and decided these issues historically.

And with that, I would reiterate my objection to the Senator from New York's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, two issues: First, the op-ed by Jeh Johnson was not in reference to my legislation. In fact, he conflated my legislation with recommendations from the IRC. He mentioned lawyers in Virginia having to make the decisions. That is not what my bill says. It has never said that, and it is not how it is organized. In fact, my bill is organized by services to adjudicate these cases, as they are doing today.

Right now, prosecutors prosecute these cases, and the decision making of whether to proceed to trial would be given to them in the first instance. If they decline to prosecute, it goes right back to the commander. So, for example, if there wasn't enough evidence to prosecute the case, it would go back to the commander, who could then use a special court-martial or he could use nonjudicial punishment for related or lesser offenses. That is typically what the commanders do in these cases.

So very little changes. But what does change is the perception of the victim who is asking for unbiased review by someone who is highly trained to do that review. It also gives assurance to defendants' rights that the person making the decision is unbiased and is highly and professionally trained.

Those changes change everything. It changes the perception that our military justice is blind, fair, and professional. And that is not the impression of servicemembers today. Both women and men and survivors of sexual assault do not believe that justice is possible for them, and Black and Brown servicemembers do not believe the justice system is fair to them either.

This solution makes sense, and I do not think that we should defer again our responsibility to one op-ed by one former SecDef. That is not our job, and that is not how we should be responding.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1:45 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:15 p.m., recessed until 1:45 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KING).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tien nomination?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE.)

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 241 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt	Johnson	Rounds
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Scott (SC)
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Lujan	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warnock
Fischer	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Portman	Young

NAYS—34

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Lummis	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	
Grassley	Paul	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Cramer	Peters
Burr	Moran	Thune

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The Senator from Maryland.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HELSINKI COMMISSION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time as the Chair of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, better known as the Helsinki Commission, as we celebrate our 45th anniversary.

The Helsinki Commission is the vehicle for U.S. participation in the Organi-

zation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, representing 57 states that have come together under the OSCE, all the countries of Europe, all the countries of the former Soviet Union, including those located in Central Asia, the United States, and Canada.

Mr. President, this is a unique body in that it represents both the executive and legislative branches of government. The executive branch has representatives on the Helsinki Commission, and both the House and Senate have Senators and Representatives that serve on the Helsinki Commission.

I am very pleased to have as my co-leader Senator WICKER from Mississippi as the Republican leader in the Senate on the Helsinki Commission.

The Helsinki Commission has been responsible for elevating our moral dimension to U.S. foreign policy. Its principles point out very clearly that you cannot have security without dealing with good governance and human rights; you cannot have economic progress unless you have governance that respects the rights of all its citizens.

That is why I was so pleased when President Biden announced that his foreign policy would be value-based, that as we participate in our foreign policy challenges, it will always be wrapped in our values, and his recent trip to Europe underscored that important lesson. And then he issued, not 2 weeks ago, the statement that corruption is a core national security threat and that we have a responsibility to fight corruption in order to protect our national security.

I am so pleased of the accomplishments of the Helsinki Commission, particularly from the human rights and human dimension. I go back to my early days in the House of Representatives, when the Soviet Union still existed and the challenges of Soviet Jews trying to emigrate from the Soviet Union. It was the Helsinki Commission that was one of the leading voices to help deal with Soviet Jews.

I think about trafficking in persons, modern-day slavery, and the efforts that the United States did in leading that effort, including passing landmark legislation in trafficking in persons and establishing a rating system where every country in the world is rated on how well they are dealing with fighting trafficking. Now this has become the model, and so many countries have acted. It was the U.S. Helsinki Commission that led the effort for what Congress was able to pass and the international effort in order to fight trafficking in persons.

I think about the perpetrators of war crimes and crimes against humanity and genocide, and recognize that it was the Helsinki Commission that pushed to hold those who were responsible for these atrocities accountable, particularly as it related to the Balkan conflict.

Then I think about the landmark legislation that was passed in the Congress that deals with sanctions against

human rights violators, first the Magnitsky sanctions and then the Global Magnitsky sanctions. It came out of hearings from the Helsinki Commission and legislation that we authored. It is not only the standard here in the United States. It has been adopted as the standard in Europe, in Canada, and in other countries, to make it clear that human rights violators will not be able to hide their illicit funds in our banking system or visit our country.

Perhaps our strongest contribution is the oversight hearings that we hold. We also passed the Elie Wiesel Atrocities Prevention Act. But just last week we had a hearing in the Helsinki Commission on how we can prevent atrocities from occurring in the first place. So I am very proud of the accomplishments of the Commission.

Part of the responsibilities of every member state of the OSCE is that we have the right to challenge any state's compliance with the Helsinki Final Act Accords. So it is our responsibility to challenge when Russia violates those provisions or we see violations in Turkey—any member state you can challenge.

But we also have to do our own self-evaluation. As chairman of the Commission, I have been using that opportunity to question conduct in our own country when it does not match the responsibilities that we should have. We saw that in the past in regard to the torture issues in Guantanamo Bay.

My participation in the Helsinki Commission goes back to my early days in the House of Representatives and some of my proudest moments of representing our country on the international stage. Let me just give you a few examples.

In February 1991, I joined a fact-finding mission to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. That is when the Soviet tanks were in Vilnius. That is when the Soviet Union was demonstrating oppression against the people of the Baltic States. It was a very sad moment of oppression, and we went there to stand up for the people of the region, to let them know that the United States never recognized the Soviet's occupation of the Baltic States, and that we stood with the people and their independence.

It was very interesting. We went from there to Moscow, and Mikhail Gorbachev didn't want to have anything to do with us. He wouldn't have a meeting with us, and he wouldn't acknowledge that we were there. But we had a meeting with Boris Yeltsin, who at that time was the chair of the parliament, and we got great visibility. And Yeltsin supported our efforts to condemn the Russian use of force.

I have been to Germany several times. My first trip on behalf of the Helsinki Commission was when it was a divided country, and we went to East Berlin. We were the voices for those oppressed people whose voices could not otherwise be heard, and we gave them hope that one day they would see freedom.

I then returned when we were literally taking down the Berlin Wall, and I joined in taking down part of the Berlin Wall. I have part of that as a prized possession in my home.

I have returned to Germany as a united country and see what a democratic Germany means and the work of our Commission to bring down the Iron Curtain. Germany is now a leading democratic state and a great ally of the United States.

I have been to Kiev, Ukraine, on several occasions. I was there during the Maidan protests, where the people demanded democracy. And then I had a chance to return and monitor the elections in Ukraine with Senator PORTMAN—again, a country that has been able to rid itself of the oppression of the Soviet Union.

I have been very active in the Helsinki Commission in regards to the Parliamentary Assembly. I chaired one of their three standing committees. I had a chance to become vice president at the Parliamentary Assembly.

Today, I acknowledge Senator WICKER, who is vice president. It points out the bipartisan nature of the Helsinki Commission and our work on the international platform.

TRIBUTE TO ERIKA SCHLAGER

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we could not have accomplished any of these achievements without an incredible dedicated staff to the mission of the Helsinki Commission, and I want to just acknowledge one individual who recently announced that she is retiring, Erika Schlager, after 34 years of service to the Commission and to the global community.

Erika received her bachelor's degree from the University of North Carolina in Greensboro, where she graduated magna cum laude and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. She earned her A.M. degree from Harvard University in Soviet Union studies and her juris doctor degree with honors from the George Washington University Law School. She studied at Warsaw University as a Fulbright fellow and received a diploma from the International Institute of Human Rights in Strasbourg, France. Quite a record.

She used that academic preparation to make a difference in the world—and what a difference she made. Erika has been an unfailing professional in her dedication to doing whatever is necessary to ensure that the Commission meets its mandate and defends human rights abroad. Her deep expertise, which she has honed over decades of work, is renowned both among policy professionals in the United States and in the countries of Central Europe that she followed for the Commission.

Erika is one of our Nation's top experts on Europe's most vulnerable communities. She is a leading voice on Roma rights—Europe's largest minority, with significant populations also in the United States.

I have joined Erika in the crusade to speak up for the Roma population, a group that has been denied citizenship in so much of Europe. What a difference she has made in their lives.

Erika has worked with Members of Congress, the Department of State and the OSCE to address issues ranging from the enslavement and sterilization of Roma to a permanent memorial in Berlin dedicated to the Sinti and Roma victims of the Nazi regime, to annual recognition of International Roma Day.

She has brought to my attention the candidacy of Ethel Brooks to be the first Roma board member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. I know that Erika will continue to bring Roma perspective and history on the Holocaust to further the tolerance, education, and human rights work of the museum.

I have the honor of representing the Senate on the Holocaust Memorial Museum board, and I can tell you that Erika is so deeply respected by the professionals at that museum for the work she has done in furthering the goal of that institution to prevent atrocities against any groups of people.

Erika has long been one of my top advisers on the Holocaust restitution and Europe's Jewish community. She has worked closely with me over the years to raise concerns about the rise of Holocaust revisionism in countries like Hungary and Poland; to foster implementation of the Terezin Declaration on Holocaust Era Assets measures to right the economic wrongs that accompanied the Holocaust; and to hold accountable a French railway that transported thousands of Holocaust victims to their deaths. She worked on all of these issues and made significant progress.

Erika has been instrumental in ensuring that the Helsinki Commission works to hold the United States accountable for our own human rights record, examining U.S. policies and conduct concerning Guantanamo Bay detention camps and U.S. policy regarding torture.

Erika's counsel greatly assisted me in my role as the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE's Special Representative on Anti-Semitism, Racism, and Intolerance, where I was focused on human rights and justice here at home and across the expanse of the 57 participating states of the OSCE.

From the plight of African Americans and Muslims to migrants and refugees, Erika has been integral to the Helsinki Commission's mandate of upholding the myriad of human rights commitments defined in the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent OSCE agreements.

In addition to her many professional milestones and achievements, Erika retires from the Commission having left a deeply personal mark on those she worked with, from diplomats and civil servants to the staff of the Helsinki Commission. She is a natural teacher

with a gift of taking a complex issue and distilling it in a way that makes it both relevant and accessible.

Erika has taught our diplomats at the Foreign Service Institute and spoken at international meetings and at universities across the Nation and around the world. She displayed her exceptional teaching ability at the Department of State's annual training program on Roma rights, and she has ensured that Roma civil society groups could also participate.

She has actively sought out dialogue and collaboration with new colleagues to help deepen their understanding of the Helsinki Commission's role, of the challenges the Commission could usefully seek to address abroad, and of the unique tools at its disposal to do just that.

Erika is always quick to ask about a colleague's well-being or inquire after a family member's well-being. She has fostered collegiality among the Commission's staff through her unfailing kindness and good nature. In so doing, she has repeatedly demonstrated how deeply she cares, not just for the work she has dedicated her career to but also for the people whose great privilege it is to call her a colleague and a friend.

I will say on a personal basis that I have benefited so much from her friendship, from her understanding, from her strategic thinking, from where we can make a difference. We know there are a lot of problems around the world. We know we can't settle all the issues. But Erika helped us focus on areas where we can make a difference, and thanks to her input, we have made a difference.

I know I speak on behalf of all Helsinki Commission members and staff and scores of other individuals—many who may not know her name—and groups concerned about advancing human rights around the globe and here at home when I say how we will miss Erika.

Henry David Thoreau said: "Aim above morality. Be not simply good; be good for something." Erika has embodied that maxim in her professional career and in her life. She has made an enormous difference, and she will continue to do so.

I wish her all the best with respect to her future endeavors. I know we will continue to hear from her.

Thank you, Erika, for the way you served the Commission, our country, and the global community.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOUISIANA

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, June marks the start of the Atlantic hurri-

cane season, and 2021 is on us, but my constituents are still suffering from the storms of 2020. There are a lot of folks in Louisiana who are still hurting. If you were to fly over Lake Charles, LA, you would still see blue tarps on roofs of homes damaged a year ago.

I took to the Senate floor last month stressing the need for disaster supplemental while Lake Charles and Baton Rouge at that time were getting hit by heavy rains and severe flooding. At the time, Lake Charles ended up with 8 to 15 inches of rain in less than 12 hours. It is heartbreaking to see them affected once more by a natural disaster. Baton Rouge got more than 13 inches of rain overnight, with 15,000 homes and businesses without power the next morning. All this comes on the heels of Hurricanes Laura and Delta and winter storms which had catastrophic damage to livestock, crops, and structures for Louisiana farmers.

For those who need a refresher, 2020 set a record for the most named storms—30 in 1 season and 5 of those named storms hitting Louisiana, which is also a record. Hurricane Laura, a category 4 hurricane, hit Lake Charles, devastated it, and then almost the exact same place that Laura hit, Delta hit—category 2—6 weeks later. It is unprecedented to have one hurricane followed by another.

NOAA calculates the damage from Hurricane Laura at about \$19 billion and Delta at \$2.9 billion. Laura wreaked havoc through devastating winds, which reached 150 miles per hour at landfall—the strongest hurricane to hit my State since 1856. Delta was just rain. In LeBleu Settlement, just northeast of Lake Charles, they received almost 18 inches.

I may sound like a broken record, but I need to just play this broken record once more. We cannot allow the impact of an entire year's worth of natural disasters to go unaddressed.

Just a few weeks ago, I was in Lake Charles, and I heard incredible frustration about rebuilding in the aftermath of these storms—a church still with its roof ripped off; homes, as I mentioned, covered with tarps—and stories from members of the community who are not back in their homes and, frankly, may not even be back in their city because there are no homes and there is no housing for them to return to.

The people in Lake Charles have an incredible resilience and an incredible we-can-do spirit. So you go there, and people are laughing and they are smiling, but then you see that blue tarp, and you know that this community will not recover at the way things are going. I would argue that the weather events were tragic, but the lack of action upon recovery is making a tragedy worse.

In March, my colleague from Oregon, Senator JEFF MERKLEY, and I urged the Biden administration to support a supplemental disaster appropriation to urgently address and direct Federal re-

sources to communities throughout America struggling to recover from hurricanes, floods, wildfires, and other 2020 natural disasters.

President Biden came to Louisiana. Once more, he heard from Mayor Nic Hunter, Governor Edwards, and myself that we could hopefully have some relief. We need programs like community development block grants, disaster recovery, mitigation funding, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineer funding for southwest coastal Louisiana hurricane and storm damage risk reduction. We need emergency solutions grants and social services block grants to provide assistance to the thousands of families who have lost their homes due to hurricanes like those I have been describing.

We are past due moving quickly. If it happened tomorrow, it still would have not happened quickly, and we have gone into another year which could have similar storms. We need to help the people of Southwest Louisiana. The region has been pounded. My job is to do all I can to help them get back on their feet.

Once more, I call on my colleagues in the House and the Senate with a simple message: Let's get a disaster supplemental done.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

EXCELLENCE IN MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION TREATMENT ACT OF 2021

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I am here today and soon on the floor my good friend Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri will be here as well to talk about an issue that we both care very, very passionately about. In fact, on October 31, 2013, which I guess it is amazing how time flies, but in 2013, Senator BLUNT and I stood here on the Senate floor together to mark a very important anniversary. It was 50 years to the day after President Kennedy signed into law the Community Mental Health Act—50 years to the day. And, tragically, it was the last piece of legislation he ever signed, and it was one of the most important.

The Community Mental Health Act was groundbreaking; its goal, to provide full funding for comprehensive mental health services in the community. How important. Unfortunately, that has yet to fully happen. Instead, behavioral health is funded primarily through grants that start and then the grant stops. You would never say to someone who is having a heart attack: We would love to help you, but we are so sorry the grant ran out. Can you

come back in 6 months? And yet that is what we say to people with mental illness or a substance abuse disorder. Every day, multiple times a day, that is what people hear.

These people who need help aren't abstractions, they are our moms and dads and brothers and sisters and sons and daughters and friends and, in fact, us. I am so grateful to Members who have shared their own mental health stories; that includes my friend, Senator TINA SMITH, who bravely shared her own struggle with depression that so, so many of us have had throughout our lives.

We know that with the right support, people who live with some kind of a mental health challenge can thrive. They do. I have often told the story of growing up in Clare, MI, a little rural town, where my dad had struggles and was misdiagnosed for years and finally, finally, finally, correctly diagnosed as being bipolar and getting the support and help with medication he needed, and he was able to thrive after that. And that is what I want to have for every person in Michigan, every family in Michigan, every family across the country.

Unfortunately, far too many people still struggle to get the support that they need. We certainly have seen that during the COVID-19 pandemic, and it has gotten much, much worse, unfortunately, with everything everybody has had to go through.

One CDC report found that last June, twice as many people as usual said they were experiencing symptoms of anxiety and depression—not surprising—and 11 percent of Americans have reported having serious thoughts of suicide in the past 30 days—in the past 30 days. And, tragically, 200 Americans are dying every day due to opioid overdoses, according to the CDC. And that is up 34 percent since the pandemic started—34 percent. Clearly, we need to do more to get people the mental health care and the substance abuse treatment that they need and that they deserve.

The good news is, we are well on our way to ensuring that healthcare above the neck will be treated like healthcare below the neck. This is an effort that Senator BLUNT and I have now been working on since that day we came to the floor in 2013. We are well on the way to finally seeing President Kennedy's vision become a reality.

Not long ago, Senator BLUNT and I, as I mentioned before, after that floor speech, introduced something called the Excellence in Mental Health Act. It was signed into law in 2014. It created certified community behavioral health clinics, which are funded just like federally qualified health centers. You have high standards, the clinic meets the standards, and then they get fully funded through the healthcare system.

It requires these clinics to provide a comprehensive set of services to everyone who walks through the door, including 24/7, 365 days a year crisis serv-

ices, outpatient mental health and substance abuse treatment, and immediate screenings, risk assessments, and diagnosis. And just as important, it requires care coordination, including partnerships with emergency rooms and law enforcement and veterans organizations.

Ten States, including Missouri and Michigan, have been selected for full participation in the program. And startup grants have been extended now to a number of clinics across the country—40 States, plus the District of Columbia, 300 community clinics being funded to get things started so far, and we have more coming because of the American Rescue Plan. These clinics are already making a huge difference.

We just had a hearing in the Finance Committee this week from those speaking strongly about this model, this being the model for care in the community. Just as community health centers are the model of care for physical healthcare, certified community behavioral health clinics are now the model for mental health and addiction services.

More than half of these clinics provide same-day services. Now, that may not seem like much, but the truth of the matter is—and this has been true for years in Michigan because of lack of funding—they only are able to help people with the most severe problems. So if you want to walk in and connect with somebody and express a concern, you are probably not going to get any services—certainly, not that day—under the old system. Now, more than half of these clinics provide same-day services. Nearly all of them offer treatment within a week. Think about someone with a substance abuse issue, as well as a mental illness. Time is everything. And if someone is reaching out for help, they need to get that help right away.

Ninety-five percent of these clinics have been engaged in one or more innovative practices with law enforcement. It has actually been incredible to hear what is being done with local law enforcement. So when the police officers are called to the scene, and it is clearly an issue that may involve mental illness or substance abuse, they are able to immediately connect up with those who can provide those services instead of having to take somebody to jail when they shouldn't be in jail. And we know that many, many people in many cases around the country, the majority of people who are in the jail are people who actually need mental health help or substance abuse help. And so there is wonderful collaboration now through these clinics going on.

Statistics from the Department of Health and Human Services show that people who have received services at clinics—it is amazing numbers. I will just mention three: sixty-three percent fewer emergency room visits. I have heard from so many police officers talking about they are called to the scene, they take someone into custody

who really just needs help, and then they go to the emergency rooms or other services, and the officer, then, sits there all day or longer with them or family members waiting, waiting, waiting because there are not the services that they need. So with the certified behavioral health centers, we have 63 percent fewer visits to emergency rooms for people who have a substance abuse problem or mental illness.

Sixty percent less time in jail. We are debating a lot these days about the role of law enforcement and more calls, as we definitely need, to have support services in the community. Through the work of certified community behavioral health clinics in the communities where they exist, there has been a 60-percent reduction in folks going to jail. Instead, they are getting the help they need.

And we have seen almost a 41-percent decrease in homelessness—another major way that people end up on the street or in a shelter when what they need is help.

Currently, about 1.5 million people are accessing these services, and it is a start. We did it originally as a demonstration to show that this could actually work and make a significant difference and actually save community resources, in addition to providing people the help that they need and deserve. But we need to do more, and that is why we are speaking today.

President Kennedy believed that these services should be available to everyone who needs them, and Senator BLUNT and I agree. That is why this week we introduced our Excellence in Mental Health and Addiction Treatment Act of 2021. This legislation will expand these high-quality mental health and addiction treatment services across the country. This is the next step for States and communities across the country to be able to have the healthcare funding to provide high-quality services that we know work.

This is going to give every State the opportunity to create certified community behavioral health clinics in their communities. Just imagine what that could mean for a veteran who is living with post-traumatic stress or a young mom who recently had a baby and is struggling with postpartum depression or a college student who is working to overcome his substance use disorder, stay in school, and earn a degree but just needs some help and support to be able to make that happen.

Right now, only about 11 percent of people with substance use disorders get help in any given year. Think about that, 11 percent; about 11 percent of those struggling with an addiction are able to get help in any given year. Well, Senator BLUNT and I aren't going to stop until 100 percent of people with substance abuse disorders and other mental illnesses are able to access the care that they need to thrive.

This is really an important moment because we, over the last several years, have designed working with various administrations now, designed quality

standards. We have demonstrated that providing these services makes a difference. We have strong support from law enforcement. We have strong support from the healthcare community, from the mental health and substance abuse community in a broad way.

It is exciting to see this be something that really is bipartisan. I am so thrilled we have colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are supporting this effort signing on. We have more people signing on every day. That is because we believe in these clinics. We believe in the services and this way of providing services. We have seen it for ourselves, how it can change people's lives and give people the opportunity to be able to thrive.

When we introduced our original legislation, I spoke with Malkia Newman, whom I have known for many years. She lived for over 30 years with undiagnosed and untreated bipolar disorder. She finally got the treatment she needed through the community mental health system. And what she has done is truly amazing. We had Malkia come and speak as a witness for our healthcare subcommittee hearing in Finance that Senator DAINES and I did a few weeks ago, and she was amazing.

Malkia is team supervisor for the CNS Healthcare Anti-Stigma Program in Waterford, MI. She is a peer educator. She is developing and leading programming in Michigan and sharing her expertise all across the country. She is an ordained minister, and she is a board member of the Oakland Community Health Network, where she has served several terms as board chair and vice chair.

Last month, when she testified at our Senate Finance Health Subcommittee hearing, she said: I am living proof. I am living proof. I am an advocate, and I am proud to speak on behalf of those who have not yet found their voice.

Malkia found her voice. It is time to make sure that everyone in our communities has the support they need to do the same.

I am looking forward to working with my friend Senator BLUNT and all of our colleagues who have already signed on as original cosponsors, and we welcome everyone in this body to join us in moving forward legislation that we have demonstrated makes a difference—saving money, saving lives. It is now time to make these services available across the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I just wanted to let my friend Senator BLUNT, whom I have been talking about now on the floor—I just wanted to say, with him here—and I knew he was going to be here shortly, but I just want to say again what a real pleasure and honor it has been to partner with my friend Senator BLUNT in this really major movement to transform the way we fund community mental health and addiction services.

And our Presiding Officer has also been a leader in this. I want to thank her for that as well. But I just want to thank my partner, as I was indicating before we came down, on the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy's signing his last bill.

And I am pleased we have been able to pick up the torch, and we are going to get it over the finish line and make sure these wonderful services are available across the country.

Mr. BLUNT. Thank you. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

EXCELLENCE IN MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION TREATMENT ACT

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, let me say, our times got changed today a little bit, and I was trying to finish another thing to get over here and hear in person what Senator STABENOW had to say. She has been an incredible leader in this effort, a great partner.

As she mentioned, we came to the floor the last day of October 2013, which was the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy's signing the Community Mental Health Act. Well-intended, but an awful lot of it just didn't get done. Facilities were closed that maybe were well overdue to be closed, but the opportunities weren't put in place to replace them as that act had hoped they would be.

I think we have been in the process of making big strides toward doing that. That was 2013. In 2014, we were able to get the first pilot project for Excellence in Mental Health put into place, an eight-State pilot project, where we were looking not only at the impact on those individuals and families who needed to have their behavioral health issue treated like all other health issues but also, frankly, looking to see what impact it had on all their other health issues when your behavioral health issue is being treated as it should be.

One of the great costs in healthcare is missed appointments. You have got to believe that almost 20 percent of the population that has a behavioral health issue is more likely to miss an appointment than everybody else, and, of course, that costs the whole system, but it particularly costs them.

If you are going to the doctor when you need to, taking the medicine you are supposed to take for any kind of health issue, eating better, sleeping better, feeling better about yourself, your health issues are dealt with in a different way.

Nearly one in five Americans, according to the NIH, has a behavioral health problem, but only a fraction of those Americans get the care they need. The NIH says they have a diagnosable—almost one out of five Americans has a diagnosable and almost always treatable behavioral health problem. But, certainly, one out of five Americans who have that problem don't get the

care they need to deal with that problem.

The COVID pandemic added to many of those challenges, and, realistically, it would, if you think about it. If you have got a behavioral health issue, that is not normally going to be helped by isolation, by worrying about healthcare for yourself or somebody you care about, wondering whether you are going to lose your job or someone in your family is going to lose their job. None of those things are going to be helpful.

The other area that comes into play there is an addiction issue of any kind. If you don't have a behavioral health issue before you have an opioid dependency or some other addiction issue, you certainly have one after that addiction takes over.

So all of those things were exacerbated by the pandemic. The percentage of Americans with symptoms of anxiety or depression grew by more than 40 percent. Drug overdose deaths increased by 20 percent between October of 2019 and 2020. It was 30 percent. I think I may have said 20–30 percent.

That was after 3 years of having drug overdose deaths headed in a dramatically different direction, but suddenly 2020 was the highest year ever for drug overdose deaths.

So the challenges of that are great. We now have 10 States, including both Missouri and Michigan, that went through a competitive process and became part of the original Excellence in Mental Health States.

In all of those States, we have certified community behavioral health clinics that have to meet standards. They have to meet standards of who staffs that clinic; they have to be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with crisis management as a possibility. They can do preventive screenings. They can determine appropriate care coordination with other providers, like emergency room departments or veterans services.

All of those things make a dramatic difference in people's lives. People getting help through the clinics often have access to primary care treatment as well. I have visited a lot of those clinics in our State. I have seen what happens with these demonstration projects. They are enabling more people to get the complete healthcare they need—and, again, including mental healthcare and addictive treatment—quicker, closer to home.

In new data from the National Council for Mental Wellbeing, 84 percent of those clinics, the CCBHCs they are calling them—84 percent of them were able to see clients within the first week. I think 100 percent of them were able to see a client who needed to be seen that day, that day. I certainly hope that is the goal. I hope nobody goes to a clinic, if professionals believe you need help right now, who doesn't get help right now.

But 84 percent of the people who show up get an appointment within the

first week. That definitely was not the case 10 years ago, and it is not the case now in States that haven't become part of this program.

Ninety-five percent of those clinics are involved with law enforcement activities and nursing and criminal justice centers. In my hometown of Springfield, MO, every patrol officer who has been trained in crisis intervention has an iPad with them that they can connect anybody they are talking to with a 24/7 Burrell community health center.

And they do. I have seen that happen. I have traveled with officers who have done that. And, by the way, I am sure they didn't have me with an officer who wasn't really good, but you could see, no matter how good that officer was, the individual, when they were talking to somebody at the clinic who was a professional dealing with this all the time, you could see that conversation took on a totally different tone.

We have seen more and more efforts to try to help with substance abuse. We have been able to fund the federally qualifying clinics in new ways because of that.

So 10 States are totally in this program. Forty States, under an amendment we made a couple of years after we got started, have been able to take county units or other units that they can qualify into the Excellence in Mental Health Program.

So what we are working on now with our colleagues is an effort to, once again, make this available to the entire country. I think we have had enough proof in the last 7 years or so to show it makes a big difference.

Again, let me say, everybody has always known that this is the right thing to do, and they have always known it is the thing that even was financially smart in the long run. I think we are also showing here how, in the immediate healthcare context, it makes a financially smart investment to help somebody with their behavioral health challenges as you are working with all of their other health challenges.

Behavioral health, mental health needs to be treated like all other health. This Congress, this year, hopefully starting in this Senate, has the ability to say: OK. We are ready to open the door now to every State that wants to participate in a program that would treat mental health like all other health.

I know Senator STABENOW and I are going to be working hard together, and you are going to be helping us as we work to get this done.

Thank you for the time today. I look forward to the further debate of these issues. I think we have come a long way within the last 8 years. We can see the full opportunity here right on the horizon.

The Congressional Budget Office, every time they look at this, thinks it costs less than they thought the time before because they are seeing the overall impact in ways that we thought these pilots would prove.

So let's get this done this year. I look forward to working hard to do it and look forward to a full debate and vote on this issue on the Senate floor.

I would yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, next week looks like a busy week. That is fine. We have a lot of things we need to be able to cover and to be able to walk through as the Senate.

Next week will be particularly divisive, though, in some of the issues that are coming up. Let me give you two examples that I hear are on the docket for next week. One of them deals with how we vote in America.

In Oklahoma, we know how we vote. Each State determines its own structure of how they vote. In Oklahoma, you can do absentee mail-in voting, with no excuses. If for any reason you want to be able to mail in a ballot, you can do that. You can do in-person voting early. In fact, this year, our State legislature met, and they added another day of in-person voting. So there are lots of days of in-person voting in Oklahoma. You could actually go to the poll the day of the election and be able to vote then. It is up to you.

We have very straightforward voter ID laws. We have a system set up that if you do early voting or absentee voting, all the disputes on those are handled before election day itself, so that on election day, when the polls close at 7 p.m., we then finish all the voting—or the counting, I should say, on early absentee, on early in-person, and then we are counting the day of. Usually by about 10:30 at night on election day, we are done voting and everyone is watching all the final results in from the entire State.

It is a pretty straightforward, clean process that we have seen that is exceptionally reliable. In fact, it is so tough, in 2016, when the Russians were probing different systems to try to get into it, our State was one of the States the Russians tried to get into, couldn't get into our system, and they moved on to other States to try to get into those.

We have a secure system. We have a reliable system. But that is apparently not enough because S. 1 that is coming to the floor next week would say: Oklahoma, we are going to completely change your system. People in Washington, DC, don't like how you vote, don't like your clean, reliable efficiency. Regardless of complaints, we think we want to change it here in Washington, DC.

Interestingly enough, we have a system that can also verify if someone voted twice. In fact, in this past election, 57 people in Oklahoma voted twice. We could verify that after the fact based on all the records, and we can go back and be able to actually prosecute those individuals who chose to vote twice because that is not legal.

Here is what happens when S. 1 comes to the floor. The debate here on S. 1 will begin with no voter ID. Take away your voter ID in Oklahoma. Change the way you do early voting. In fact, change the way the ballots are actually collected entirely. No longer in Oklahoma will we know the winner of our election at 10:30 on election night. S. 1 changes that and said that ballots have to be able to be allowed to trickle in for 10 more days after the election is over. So we won't know at 10:30 at night on election night; we will know 2 weeks later who actually won the elections.

As far as a reliable system that we can all verify and check—oh, no, it changes that dramatically. It now opens up what is called ballot harvesting. Ballot harvesting would allow political operatives to go door-to-door to be able to engage with people who had mail-in ballots and to say to them "Have you mailed your ballot in?" If they say "No," they can say "Well, let's just fill it out right here on the porch, and then you can hand it to me, and I will take it in."

So on election day, what happens is, political operatives show up with boxes full of ballots and turn in boxes full of ballots with the words "Trust me; these are all good."

I would tell you, in Oklahoma, we like it better when the postman carries that ballot or when you actually turn it in to that county or precinct official so we know where it has been, that there has been an accurate chain of custody, not someone showing up with a box full of ballots saying "Trust me; I collected all of these" because when that happens and someone is just collecting ballots, you have no idea if the person voting voted for one person and left the rest of them blank and the person carrying them just filled out the rest of the ballot for them. You have no chain of custody at all on it. That is why I say S. 1 makes voting easy, cheating easy, and verifying elections impossible.

This is not the direction we should go. If we want to build trust in our election system in America, let's let each State build trust in their election system for each State, like we do in Oklahoma, where we work together to make sure we can make it as easy as possible for every person to be able to vote and to encourage every person to vote, but when it is over, to verify that election and to be able to know that we can check it all off and to go, regardless of the outcome, we can trust the outcome because we know we can verify it.

Let's make it easy to vote, hard to cheat, and easy to verify—not having Washington, DC, folks here say DC is righteous and States are wrong. I think there are lots of great people all over the country who want to do their elections right and who aren't Republicans or Democrats; they are just people protecting democracies in the States. Let's keep that system.

That is the first of two divisive bills that are coming up next week, which will absolutely fail in this body and should fail in this body. There is a second bill that I understand is coming up next week, as well, and it is called the Equality Act.

Now, I will tell you that it is a great name, and I don't know of anyone on my side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle who opposes equality. I will state frankly that no person should be discriminated against in America—no person. It is a basic constitutional principle: We are all equal under the law—all of us. We have different ideas about music and food. We have different ideas about sexuality. We have different ideas about occupations. We have different skin colors. We have different faiths. We are a tapestry, and that is one of the things that makes us strong in such a perfect way as to build a more perfect Union. I believe that every person should be protected from discrimination in America, but that does mean every person.

Today, the Supreme Court ruled 9 to 0—9 to 0 in the Supreme Court—that Catholic Social Services in Philadelphia was being discriminated against by the city of Philadelphia because the city of Philadelphia said to Catholic Social Services: You cannot practice your Catholic faith in foster services.

Now, what is the story?

There have been Catholic services in Philadelphia since the 1700s. For the last 50 years, Catholic Social Services in Philadelphia, this particular organization, has served the neediest children in that area by providing foster services and placement for them. They are a religious organization, a faith-based organization—a Catholic organization—and they believe that God created man and woman and that this is God's design for marriage. So, in their placement of foster children, they place children in homes where there is a man and a woman who are present in marriage because of their profound belief.

There are 20 other foster services in Philadelphia that place foster children in any family situation: husband and wife or two men or two women. There are 20 of those services in Philadelphia, but the city of Philadelphia went to Catholic Social Services and said: You have to be like the other 20. You cannot practice your faith.

Even though, literally, Catholic Social Services had never had a gay family reach out to them for an adoption placement—they had gone to other places—the city of Philadelphia said: No, you have to change your practice.

Unfortunately, Catholic Social Services had to argue for their religious freedom all the way to the Supreme Court, and, today, they ruled 9 to 0 that a faith-based institution cannot be discriminated against because of their faith. They should be able to live out the tenets of their faith and be able to practice them. To me, that is a great decision to make—to say: Why

can't we coexist? Why can't we honor everyone in their differences of opinion?

Even the Supreme Court stated today, in its opinion, that there was no work from Catholic Social Services to stop gay marriages in Philadelphia or to stop couples from fostering children who are gay couples there. They just chose not to do it based on their faith. So they were not working against individuals. They were practicing their faith.

Now comes the Equality Act vote next week. The Equality Act would, for the first time ever in this Congress, take away the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in statute—it would remove it—and say there could be no protection for religious institutions. This is a direct shot against the Supreme Court, in its 9 to 0 decision today, which said: No, religious institutions have to be protected in their decisions.

Why can't both exist? Why do we have to get into a situation, as the Equality Act does, that says, if you don't agree with one particular expression, then you have to be canceled? that you have to be silenced? Why has it come to this in America?

The way the Equality Act is written is, with regard to any faith-based institution, if they did any public, outward-facing work at all—if they fed the homeless, which many do; if they provided clothing; if they took care of individuals with food who needed it—that was considered to be of public accommodation, their labor laws, even if they were religious institutions, had to be exactly like large corporate labor rules as well. It literally imposes on religious institutions that you can be a private entity and be inward facing, but if you are going to do your mission to actually serve the needy, then you have to actually shift to be like corporate America. That is not providing opportunities for people of faith to live their faiths.

I have to tell you that I honor people of faith—people of different faiths, people of faiths that I disagree with. The nature of religious liberty in our country is to be able to honor people of different faiths. That is also what the Supreme Court reaffirmed today directly in contradiction to the Equality Act. Clearly, if this were to pass—and I do not believe it will—the Supreme Court would hear it immediately, would align with this case from today, and would say: We have already ruled on these issues 9 to 0—that is, against not allowing people to be able to live their faiths.

Unfortunately, there are some in this body who not only vehemently disagree with the Supreme Court and with the opportunity for people to be able to live their faiths, but they are willing to do it in the most pejorative of terms.

When I spoke against the Equality Act in the Judiciary Committee, just weeks ago, and shared the issues that I had that were pragmatic labor issues and set those in front of it and also did

a challenge on a religious liberty issue and said, "Here are the obvious issues of religious liberty where I think it is unconstitutional," the response I got from a member of the Judiciary Committee was, This reminds me of the Ku Klux Klan, who burned crosses and used religious symbols to hide behind their bigotry.

The Supreme Court disagreed with that today and said: We are the United States of America. We honor people of faith to be able to live their faiths. We honor people who don't have faith or have differences in their faiths and choose to be able to live that out. This body should not try to cancel out every group of faith in the country that disagrees with people in this body who say: You cannot practice your faith if we tell you no. That is not who we are.

The Equality Act is not about equality. It is about imposing and prohibiting disagreements. We are Americans. We can respect each other and disagree. We can live next-door to each other and disagree. Let's prove it in this body by not passing the poorly named Equality Act but by actually demonstrating what this act says it wants to demonstrate. Let's treat each other with respect in our differences and honor us in that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 149, Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Jacky Rosen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Sherrod Brown, Edward J. Markey, Brian Schatz, Ron Wyden, Elizabeth Warren, Mark R. Warner, Raphael Warnock, Benjamin L. Cardin.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 107, Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Angus S. King, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, John Hickenlooper, Thomas R. Carper, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher Murphy, Jacky Rosen, Robert Menendez, Martin Heinrich, Edward J. Markey.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021—
MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to proceed to Calendar No. 77, S. 2093.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 77, S. 2093.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 77, S. 2093, a bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-

corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 77, S. 2093, a bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Jeff Merkley, Amy Klobuchar, Jacky Rosen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Jon Ossoff, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Brian Schatz, Sherrod Brown, Ron Wyden, Elizabeth Warren, Raphael Warnock, Benjamin L. Cardin, Edward J. Markey, Bernard Sanders.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, June 17, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 180, 183, 153, 155, and 177.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Pamela A. Melroy, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Richard W. Spinrad, of Oregon, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere; Matthew T. Quinn, of Montana, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs; Tanya Marie Trujillo, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and Chris Inglis, of Maryland, to be National Cyber Director (New Position).

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote en bloc on the nominations without intervening action or debate and that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements

related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Melroy, Spinrad, Quinn, Trujillo, and Inglis nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 178, 179, 181, 184, and 185; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard, and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 305:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Michael F. McAllister

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard, and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 305:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Paul F. Thomas

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Commandant in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated pursuant to the authority of title 14, U.S.C., section 304:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Linda L. Fagan

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 2101(A)(2):

To be lieutenant commander

Charles J. Clark
Nicholas G. Derenzo
Katherine R. Peet
Luke P. Strittmatter

The following named officers for appointment in the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard as a member of the Coast Guard permanent commissioned teaching staff under title 14, U.S.C., section 1943:

To be lieutenant commander

Lisa M. Thompson

To be lieutenant

Tara E. Larkin

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

AMENDING TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REDEFINE THE EASTERN AND MIDDLE JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 1340 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1340) to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1340) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1340

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 113 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “and Wilson and” and inserting “Wilson, those portions of Hoke, Moore, Scotland, and Richmond counties encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall, and”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) MIDDLE DISTRICT.—The Middle District comprises the counties of Alamance, Cabarrus, Caswell, Chatham, Davidson, Davie, Durham (excluding that portion of Durham County encompassing the Federal Correctional Institution, Butner, North Carolina), Forsyth, Guilford, Hoke (excluding that portion of Hoke County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Lee, Montgomery, Moore (excluding that portion of Moore County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Orange, Person, Randolph, Richmond (excluding that portion of Richmond County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Rowan, Scotland (excluding that portion of Scotland County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Stanly, Stokes, Surry, and Yadkin.”

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any action commenced or pending in any judicial district of North Carolina before the date of enactment of this Act.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA GATORS FOR WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN'S TENNIS CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 276, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 276) congratulating the University of Florida Gators for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Tennis Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 276) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI REBELS WOMEN'S GOLF TEAM ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN'S GOLF CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 277, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 277) congratulating the University of Mississippi Rebels women's golf team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's golf championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 277) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED SPINAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 278 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 278) recognizing the 75th anniversary of United Spinal Association, a leading national advocacy organization that is dedicated to promoting the independence and enhancing the quality of life of all people living with spinal cord injuries and neurological disorders, including veterans, and providing support and information to their loved ones, care providers, and personal support networks.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 278) was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2118

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2118) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. PETERS. Madam President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's vote on Executive Calendar #123—Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted “aye” on confirmation.

Madam President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's votes on motion to invoke cloture and confirmation of Executive Calendar #157, John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted “aye” on the motion and “aye” on confirmation. ●

JUNETEENTH

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President. I rise today to recognize the annual commemoration of Juneteenth, the date on which the news of the end of slavery reached the enslaved peoples in the Southwestern States. On June 19, 1865, MG Gordon Granger and Union soldiers communicated the news of liberation to one of the last remaining confederate outposts in Galveston, TX. Over 2 years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, the enslaved individuals there had yet to hear the good news.

Over the years, African-American communities nationwide and in Maryland have developed rich traditions around this historically significant date. For all Americans, Juneteenth offers an opportunity to reflect upon and to educate ourselves further about the terrible history of slavery and its enduring legacy. The story of Juneteenth also reminds me of the gap between the values and principles that we espouse and the realities of life for everyday Americans, in particular the most vulnerable.

I have long supported legislation to add Juneteenth National Independence Day to the list of legal Federal public holidays. After many years, I am pleased that the Senate has finally passed it and hope that the House will act swiftly to send this bill to President Biden's desk.

In commemoration of this year's holiday, I want to take the opportunity to reflect in more depth on a couple of ways that we continue to see the clear impact of slavery today. One of the most apparent legacies is access—or should I say lack of access—to the ballot box. Study after study and the lived experiences of so many individuals tell us that Black Americans still experience greater barriers to voting than White Americans. One of the most important tenets of our comprehensive legislation to protect democracy, the For the People Act, S. 1, is enacting a Federal floor when it comes to voting rights standards.

Spreading false or misleading information intended to suppress voting and intimidate the electorate remains one of the most effective methods used to keep individuals, particularly Black Americans and other racial minorities, from voting. Advancements in our means of communication, including the rise of social media platforms, have made it easier for bad actors to use these strategies. During the 2020 election cycle, robocalls targeting communities of color in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and New York contained false information about how the recipients' data would be shared if they voted by mail. I have introduced legislation, along with Senator KLOBUCHAR, to address these problems by prohibiting individuals from knowingly deceiving others about the time, place, eligibility, or procedures of participating in a Federal election. Our bill to ban deceptive practices, S. 1840, would

also prohibit individuals from intentionally hindering, interfering with, or preventing another person from voting, registering to vote, or aiding another person to vote or register to vote in a Federal election.

In 2020, more than 5 million individuals and as many as one in five African Americans in some States were disenfranchised because of voter suppression laws.

Many voter disenfranchisement laws today come from post-Civil War efforts to stifle the 14th and 15th Amendments. Between 1865 and 1880, at least 13 States enacted or expanded their felony disenfranchisement laws. One of the primary goals of these laws was to prevent Black Americans from voting. At least 11 of those States still bar individuals on felony probation or parole from voting. Under our Constitution, there is no legitimate justification for denying people from having a voice in our democracy. Disenfranchising citizens who are living and working in the community serves no compelling State interest and hinders their rehabilitation and reintegration into society. My Democracy Restoration Act, S. 481, would restore Federal voting rights for all individuals immediately upon release from incarceration.

I am proud that both my Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Act and my Democracy Restoration Act are included within the For the People Act.

Finally, I want to end by commending my home State of Maryland for bipartisan restorative justice work over the past several years. The Maryland General Assembly voted nearly unanimously in 2019 to investigate the more than 40 documented racial terror lynchings that took place in Maryland between 1854 and 1933, to hold public hearings in communities where racial terror lynchings occurred, and to develop recommendations that are rooted in restorative justice for addressing, engaging, and reconciling those communities. The commission the State established has received supplemental funding from the U.S. Department of Justice's Emmett Till Cold Case Investigations Program for its efforts. Because of this work, Governor Hogan issued posthumous pardons last month for 34 victims of racial lynchings in Maryland.

This Juneteenth, I encourage all Americans to recognize Juneteenth as an opportunity to reflect upon our Nation's shared history, to recognize the enduring effects of slavery on our society, and to commit to being involved in the redemptive work toward a more just and perfect Union.

NATIONAL SEERSUCKER DAY

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, today I rise in recognition of seersucker manufacturers and enthusiasts across the United States. I wish everyone a happy National Seersucker Day. This uniquely American fashion has a

storied history dating back to 1909. The first seersucker suit was designed by Joseph Haspel at his Broad Street facility in New Orleans, LA. Louisiana is proud to have played an important part in introducing the country to seersucker apparel.

This lightweight cotton fabric, known for its signature pucker, has been worn and enjoyed by Americans across the country during the hot summer months. Mr. Haspel said it best: "Hot is hot, no matter what you do for a living."

In the 1990s, Seersucker Day was established by Members of this Chamber to honor this unique American fashion. I proudly resumed this tradition in 2014 in the U.S. House of Representatives and continued this tradition in the U.S. Senate. This year, I wish to designate Thursday, June 17, as the eighth annual National Seersucker Day. I encourage everyone to wear seersucker on this day to commemorate this traditionally American clothing.

TRIBUTE TO MAX ENGLISH

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, SGM Max English served the Nation honorably for over 28 years in the U.S. Army. He fought in combat operations throughout World War II and bravely led 36 men as a platoon sergeant in the Battle of the Bulge. His extraordinary service continued to the Pacific theater in the waning months of the war. Only a few years later, he returned to the Pacific to fight in the Korean war.

During his service in the Second World War, Sergeant Major English was injured in Germany and was awarded the Purple Heart. During the Battle of Bulge, Sergeant Major English fought and repelled repeated Nazi attacks and ultimately helped break the back of Hitler's forces. After sustained combat operations in Europe, Sergeant Major English served in the Southern Pacific theater and pursued the treacherous mission of rooting out irreconciled Japanese Imperial Army forces after their country's unconditional surrender.

A member of "the greatest generation", Sergeant Major English again answered the call of duty when he was deployed to the Korean war. There, his unit was tasked with repatriating Americans formerly held as prisoners of war during the conflict. The heroic actions of Sergeant Major English's unit directly contributed to the implementation of an armistice to stop the fighting on the Korean Peninsula.

Sergeant Major English is a man of exceptional character and commitment to the United States who embodies the American spirit and serves as an inspiration for today's fighting men and women. I join all grateful Americans in congratulating him for his outstanding service and patriotism and thank him for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO JANET PIRAINO

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise today to honor the service of Janet Piraino, my State director, who will retire from my office and the U.S. Senate on July 19, 2021.

Janet has spent her professional career dedicated to serving Wisconsinites. A graduate of the University of Wisconsin—Madison, Janet forged a path in public service early in her career. Her first job was as a field organizer for a race for Wisconsin Governor, followed by nearly 10 years as a legislative policy advisor to Wisconsin legislators in the State Capitol.

Janet quickly earned recognition as a valued staff member and committed leader. Her experiences working with both legislators and constituents led to her assuming positions in a variety of roles, both at the local and Federal government level.

Over the past 30-plus years, Janet has served in a variety of capacities with many Wisconsin elected officials, including 7 years as State director for U.S. Senator Russ Feingold; 2 years as chief of staff for Congressman Tom Barrett; 8 years as chief of staff for Madison Mayor Dave Cieslewicz; and 2 years as district director for U.S. Congressman MARK POCAN. Outside of her roles in government, Janet has also worked as a special assistant for State relations at the University of Wisconsin System and as vice president for advancement at the Overture Center Foundation in Madison, where she led the charge to help transition this legacy performing arts venue from a city-run venue to a privately owned facility.

Janet is also an active member of many community organizations, including Madison's Downtown Rotary. She spends considerable time engaged in meeting with others interested in pursuing a career in public service and has mentored countless Wisconsinites over these many years.

Outside of the office, Janet enjoys spending time with her partner of 20 years, J.R. Sims, their grandbaby, Titan Cairo Sims, and their enthusiastic pandemic puppy, Sadie. Janet also enjoys traveling and participating in organized bike rides, including the Door County Century and the Best Dam Bike Tour on her Wisconsin made Trek Madone. She is a devoted fan of the Milwaukee Bucks, especially Giannis Antetokounmpo, and is always eager to host friends and colleagues on her roof deck overlooking the Madison skyline.

I knew of Janet's can-do reputation and energetic commitment to public service long before she joined my Senate office in 2015, and I am delighted that she has become a valued member of our team. Along with my entire U.S. Senate staff, I wish her all the best as she begins a new chapter with her well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL DAVID W. TROTTER

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I rise to pay tribute to COL David W. Trotter, who has selflessly served our great country as a U.S. Army intelligence officer. He is a fellow alumnus of the Iowa State University Cyclone Battalion and a dear friend of mine.

Colonel Trotter will retire on November 30, 2021, after a successful 30-year military career as an accomplished leader, infantry, and intelligence officer. Dave's leadership abilities were evident early on. I met Dave early in my days at Iowa State, where he served as a personal mentor and driving factor to my own service to this great Nation. From those early days, he grew even more as a leader and soldier, ultimately completing a storied career at home and abroad, in peace and in war. It is fitting that we recognize his service to this great Nation.

Colonel Trotter was commissioned in 1992 upon graduating from Iowa State University as a distinguished military graduate with a bachelor in business. Dave served as an infantry platoon leader in Korea and a company executive officer at Fort Carson, CO. He then was selected as a company commander for 18 months with Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 5th Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment in Fort Lewis, WA. After command, he served as an operations officer for the Des Moines, IA, Recruiting Battalion before being selected for the prestigious 75th Ranger Regiment.

Upon arrival at the 75th Ranger Regiment in Fort Benning, GA, Dave served as an assistant intelligence officer. He then was selected again for command, where he served as the military intelligence detachment commander. Throughout his time in the 75th Ranger Regiment, Dave deployed in support of Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

As a field-grade officer, Dave served as an operations officer in the XVIII Airborne Corps, G2 section at Fort Bragg, NC. He then served as an operations officer and executive officer within the 525th Battlefield Surveillance Brigade, where he also deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. He then served again as an operations officer for the Intelligence and Security Command at Fort Belvoir, VA, before being selected for command of the Army Geospatial Intelligence Battalion at Springfield, VA.

After various staff positions, Dave served as the chief of staff, Afghanistan Ministry of Interior Advisory Group, where he deployed again to Afghanistan in support of Operations Enduring Freedom and Freedom Sentinel. After a brief year on staff at Fort Huachuca, AZ, Dave deployed again in support of Operation Inherent Resolve in Iraq, where he served as the III Corps G2. After redeployment, he was chosen to serve as the Army North senior intel-

ligence officer. He then would transfer once more to Joint Base San Antonio, Fort Sam Houston, TX, where he served as the executive officer to the commanding general of Army North, Fifth Army.

As his final assignment in uniform, COL David W. Trotter was selected to serve as the deputy commander for Joint Base San Antonio and the vice commander of the 502d Air Base Wing.

A highly decorated officer, Dave earned several service awards, including the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster and the Bronze Star with oak leaf cluster, for his service. He also earned the Ranger Tab, the Master Parachutist Badge, the Pathfinder Badge, and the Air Assault Badge.

Dave has deployed in support of combat operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria. He has served at every level and commanded with distinction at the company through brigade levels within the conventional force and within the Army's premier Special Operations Command. He and his family have sacrificed so much to ensure America can be what it is today.

David, congratulations on your successful career and well-deserved retirement. I want to thank you and your family for the sacrifices you have made over the past 30 years. I join my colleagues in Congress and all Americans as we express our deepest appreciation for your service, acknowledge you and your family's many accomplishments and sacrifices, and wish the very best for you, your wife Tami, and your son Ty in the future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO NADIA HEDAYAT

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Nadia for her hard work as an intern in the Senate Republican Conference. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Nadia is a native of Maryland. She is a student at American University, where she studies psychology and communication: film and media arts. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Nadia for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey. •

TRIBUTE TO DR. SOPHIA L. THOMAS

• Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, it is with great pride that I recognize a constituent of mine, Sophia L. Thomas, DNP, APRN, FNP-BC, PPCNP-BC,

FNAP, FAANP, of New Orleans, LA for her service over the last 2 years as president of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners, AANP.

Dr. Thomas has an exemplary career of service as a certified family and pediatric nurse practitioner and has been providing health care for over 25 years to medically underserved populations in the greater New Orleans, LA, region. Dr. Thomas practices at a federally qualified health center in New Orleans and is a clinical preceptor. As a primary care provider, Dr. Thomas provides her patients with access to cost-effective, patient-centered healthcare. Dr. Thomas has continued to work on the frontlines throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, including educating the public, diagnosing and treating patients, and going door to door to vaccinate residents in New Orleans.

She holds a doctoral degree in nursing practice from Loyola University New Orleans, where she was honored with the Post-Master's DNP Nightingale Award, and she has a master's in nursing from Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center. She was inducted as fellow of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners in 2012. In 2020, Dr. Thomas was chosen as one of Modern Healthcare's 100 Most Influential People in Healthcare.

The American Association of Nurse Practitioners is the largest national professional membership organization for nurse practitioners. Under Dr. Thomas's tenure, AANP membership has grown to more than 118,000 members. Dr. Thomas has helped lead nurse practitioners in transforming patient-centered healthcare and has made tremendous strides in ensuring that policymakers and the public understand the care that nurse practitioners provide to millions of Americans each year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Sophia L. Thomas on a successful term as president of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners and in thanking her for the excellent health care she has and continues to provide to her patients as well as her leadership to the nurse practitioner profession.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2021, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 16, 2021, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 475. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 475. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

H.R. 711. An act to amend the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 to authorize the use of certain funds received pursuant to leases entered into under such Act, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill, S. 475, was subsequently signed by the Vice President.

The enrolled bill, H.R. 711, was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 12:11 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 256. An act to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.

H.R. 1187. An act to provide for disclosure of additional material information about public companies and establish a Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 256. An act to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1187. An act to provide for disclosure of additional material information about public companies and establish a Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2093. A bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2118. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 17, 2021, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 475. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC-1224. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order that elaborates upon measures to address the national emergency with respect to the information and communications technology and services supply chain that was declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-20. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to take such actions as are necessary to rename the Department of Veterans Affairs' Lafayette Community Based Outpatient Clinic in honor of Rodney C. Hamilton Sr.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 46

Whereas, Rodney Carroll Hamilton Sr. was born in Fort Worth, Texas, on March 24, 1932, and his family moved to Lafayette, Louisiana, in the summer of 1948; and

Whereas, God, family, country, and community were his strong interests; and

Whereas, in 1949, he joined the Marine Reserve at age seventeen while attending Lafayette High School at the urging of his football coach, Lou Campbell; and

Whereas, Rodney served our country during the Korean War, was wounded in combat in September 1951, and was awarded the Purple Heart; and

Whereas, he loved the United States Marine Corps and was proud of all Marines who served their country; and

Whereas, his military involvement included being a member of the Marine Corps League, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Veteran's Action Coalition of Southwest Louisiana where he served as Founder and Chairman Emeritus; and

Whereas, he served as a full-time elected official in the Lafayette city government from 1968 through 1972 as a Trustee of Public Property; and

Whereas, Rodney made numerous contributions to help make Lafayette a better place

including leading efforts to secure and build the United States Department of Veterans Affairs' Lafayette Community Based Outpatient Clinic, which opened in 2016; and

Whereas, due to Rodney's dedication in realizing the veterans clinic in Lafayette, the street there was named in his honor and now bears signs saying, "Veterans Way, Honorary Rodney Hamilton"; and

Whereas, Rodney Carroll Hamilton Sr. passed away at the age of eighty-eight on November 30, 2020. Therefore, be it

Resolved that the Legislature of Louisiana hereby memorializes the Louisiana congressional delegation and the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to rename the United States Department of Veterans Affairs' Lafayette Community Based Outpatient Clinic in honor of Rodney C. Hamilton Sr., and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-21. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress to extend federal tax incentives to participants in Jumpstart Savings programs that are similar to those that are currently provided to participants in College Savings plans; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

Whereas, The economy of the United States is experiencing increased demands for highly trained, skilled tradespeople to fill jobs in the construction, welding, and other vocational sectors; and

Whereas, In the United States, there are nearly half a million more jobs available in the skilled trades than workers with the skills to fill them; and

Whereas, The number of available jobs in the skilled trades is anticipated to rise to two million over the next decade; and

Whereas, A traditional college education is one path to success, but not the only path, especially in light of the increasing costs of a traditional four-year college degree and the growing demand for skilled labor; and

Whereas, Encouraging students and their families to invest in alternative forms of postsecondary skills could help reshape our nation's future workforce; and

Whereas, Providing the next generation the ability to save money for the future costs of tools, equipment, and business expenses will make it easier to enter a vocation, trade, or start a small business in the skilled trades industry; and

Whereas, The West Virginia Legislature has adopted legislation authorizing the West Virginia Jumpstart Savings Program, which creates several tax incentives to help program participants save money, by allowing an income tax deduction for contributions to a Jumpstart Savings account, by providing businesses with a non-refundable state tax credit for matching an employee's own contribution to his or her account each year; and

Whereas, The Jumpstart Savings Program will allow individuals to roll 529 College Savings plan funds over to a Jumpstart Savings account without facing state income tax penalties; and

Whereas, West Virginia's Jumpstart Savings Program could be a model for other states to invest in the future entrepreneurship and small business trade industries in our nation, and Congress should extend federal tax benefits to such programs; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia:

That Congress is urged to provide tax benefits to participants in Jumpstart Savings programs that are similar to those currently provided to participants in College Savings plans pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 529; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution, along with a copy of the Jumpstart Savings Act, to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to members of West Virginia's congressional delegation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary. Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit. Anne Milgram, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement. Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2094. A bill to provide for a new building period with respect to the cap on full-time equivalent residents for purposes of payment for graduate medical education costs under the Medicare program for certain hospitals that have established a shortage specialty program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 2095. A bill to expand compassionate release authority and elderly home confinement access for offenders with heightened coronavirus risk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2096. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize admission of Canadian retirees as long-term visitors for pleasure described in section 101(a)(15)(B) of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the permissible first-dollar coverage of telehealth services for purposes of health savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 2098. A bill to prevent States from using or distributing resources during the COVID-19 national emergency in accordance with a State policy that discriminates on the basis of disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 2099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals who are not enrolled in a high deductible health plan to have access to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2100. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for contributions to the Alzheimer's Research and Caregiving Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2102. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mammography screening for veterans who served in locations associated with toxic exposure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 2103. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to hold certain public employers liable in civil actions for deprivation of rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2104. A bill to support global labor rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2105. A bill to enhance mental health and psychological support within United States foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2106. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a national network of Statewide senior legal hotlines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the semiconductor manufacturing investment credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CASIDY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2108. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate work disincentives for childhood disability beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2109. A bill to prohibit allocations of Special Drawing Rights at the International Monetary Fund for perpetrators of genocide and state sponsors of terrorism without congressional authorization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2110. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a virtual health pilot program to facilitate utilization of remote patient monitoring technology to maintain or expand access to health care services for individuals in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2111. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the waiver of certain telehealth requirements to permit reimbursement for audio-only telehealth services under the Medicare program during emergency declarations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2112. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act to provide for Medicare and Medicaid mental and behavioral health treatment through telehealth; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 2113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand permissible distributions from an employee's health flexible spending account or health reimbursement arrangement to their health savings account; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2114. A bill to expand the definition of qualified persons for purposes of the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act to include health professional students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2115. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2116. A bill to prevent mail, telemarketing, and internet fraud targeting seniors in the United States, to promote efforts to increase public awareness of the enormous impact that mail, telemarketing, and internet fraud have on seniors, to educate the public, seniors, their families, and their caregivers about how to identify and combat fraudulent activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2117. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that voters in elections for Federal office do not wait in long lines in order to vote; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2118. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2119. A bill to provide for nonpreemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in certain boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel or persons doing business in Israel or Israeli-controlled territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. ROSEN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2120. A bill to establish the United States-Israel Artificial Intelligence Center to improve artificial intelligence research and development cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2121. A bill to develop best practice guidelines for the use of dogs in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2122. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to regulate the use of cell-site simulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2123. A bill to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and

Houses of Worship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2124. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2125. A bill to divert Federal funding away from supporting the presence of police in schools and toward evidence-based and trauma informed services that address the needs of marginalized students and improve academic outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2126. A bill to designate the Federal Office Building located at 308 W. 21st Street in Cheyenne, Wyoming, as the "Louisa Swain Federal Office Building"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2127. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require that Federal children's programs be separately displayed and analyzed in the President's budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 2128. A bill to ensure the humane treatment of pregnant women by reinstating the presumption of release and prohibiting shackling, restraining, and other inhumane treatment of pregnant detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 2129. A bill to promote freedom of information and counter censorship and surveillance in North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COONS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2130. A bill to modify the disposition of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues and to open Federal financial sharing to heighten opportunities for renewable energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 2131. A bill to require a review of the effects of FHA mortgage insurance policies, practices, and products on small-dollar mortgage lending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 2132. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the use of taxpayer funded union time for employees of the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2133. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for studies and reports relating to the impact of legislation on spending on children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2134. A bill to establish the Data Protection Agency; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2135. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Chief Operating Officer of each agency to compile a list of unnecessary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2136. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the implementation of curricula for training students, teachers, parents, and school and youth development personnel to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to signs of human trafficking and exploitation in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2137. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish an Office of Rural Investment, to ensure that rural communities and regions are equitably represented in Federal decision-making for transportation policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2138. A bill to respond to international trafficking of Cuban medical professionals by the Government of Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the use of slavery and involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. HOEVES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. Res. 274. A resolution designating July 24, 2021, as "National Day of the American Cowboy"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 275. A resolution acknowledging and apologizing for the mistreatment of, and discrimination against, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals who served

the United States in the Armed Forces, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. Res. 276. A resolution congratulating the University of Florida Gators for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Tennis Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. Res. 277. A resolution congratulating the University of Mississippi Rebels women's golf team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's golf championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. Res. 278. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of United Spinal Association, a leading national advocacy organization that is dedicated to promoting the independence and enhancing the quality of life of all people living with spinal cord injuries and neurological disorders, including veterans, and providing support and information to their loved ones, care providers, and personal support networks; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 279. A resolution designating June 21, 2021 through June 25, 2021, as "National Cybersecurity Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 280. A resolution supporting a stable Colombia and opposing any threat to democracy in Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 75

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 75, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination by abortion against an unborn child on the basis of Down syndrome.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to establish the Office of Press Freedom, to create press freedom curriculum at the National Foreign Affairs Training Center, and for other purposes.

S. 267

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 267, a bill to increase the Federal share of operating costs for certain projects that receive grants under the Formula Grants to Rural Areas Program of the Federal Transit Administration.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes.

S. 450

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SUL-LIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to award posthumously the Congressional Gold Medal to Emmett Till and Mamie Till-Mobley.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 611, a bill to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy and to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary to provide service dogs to veterans with mental illnesses who do not have mobility impairments.

S. 697

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman's birth.

S. 1368

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to make housing more affordable, and for other purposes.

S. 1488

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to establish a basic needs allowance for low-income regular members of the Armed Forces.

S. 1544

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1544, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes.

S. 1548

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1548, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diversity of participants in research on Alzheimer's disease, and for other purposes.

S. 1591

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1591, a bill to counter efforts by foreign governments to pursue, harass, or otherwise persecute individuals for polit-

ical and other unlawful motives overseas, and for other purposes.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1596, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

S. 1848

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1848, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and marital status in the administration and provision of child welfare services, to improve safety, well-being, and permanency for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning foster youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1872

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1872, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1891

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1891, a bill to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens.

S. 1909

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1909, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform requirements with respect to direct and indirect remuneration under Medicare part D, and for other purposes.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and for other purposes.

S. 1986

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1986, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and

the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1997

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1997, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain contributions by government entities are treated as contributions to capital.

S. 2058

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2058, a bill to improve the safety and security of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas and criteria air pollutant emission fees, provide rebates to low and middle income Americans, invest in fossil fuel communities and workers, invest in environmental justice communities, and for other purposes.

S. 2087

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2087, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the membership of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans to include veterans who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, gender diverse, gender non-conforming, intersex, or queer.

S. 2088

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2088, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the process by which a member of the Armed Forces may be referred for a mental health evaluation.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 67

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 67, a resolution calling for the immediate release of Trevor Reed, a United States citizen who was unjustly found guilty and sentenced to 9 years in a Russian prison.

S. RES. 240

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 240, a resolution affirming the role of the United States in improving access to quality, inclusive public education and improved learning outcomes for children and adolescents, particularly for girls, in the poorest countries through the Global Partnership for Education.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2100. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce bipartisan legislation with Senator COLLINS today to improve safety standards on products that affect every single American household. Most people assume that the personal care products they use every day are safe, whether it is shampoo or shaving cream, lotion or makeup, hair dye or deodorant.

In reality, however, these products are not approved by the Food and Drug Administration for safety before being sold, and the FDA's authority to regulate these products are sorely outdated. In fact, it's been more than eighty years since the law has changed on how oversight is conducted for these products. It is time to finally bring the FDA into the 21st century.

For the better part of a decade, Senator COLLINS and I have worked with a wide variety of stakeholders that represent industry, consumers, and health groups. Together, we introduce this Personal Care Products Safety bill with the support and input of these groups to implement commonsense and feasible measures.

One of the most critical components of this legislation is providing FDA with mandatory recall authority over these products. Without this authority, the agency has few options to ensure consumer safety.

For example, in 2019, the FDA discovered asbestos in makeup marketed to children and teens at a popular chain store. After the FDA requested that these products stop being sold, the company refused to comply with the request. Lacking the authority to mandate a recall, FDA was left with the only option of warning consumers not to use these products. This is simply unacceptable.

Under our bill, the FDA could remove these harmful products from the marketplace—whether at your local pharmacy or mall, or online. Perhaps even more importantly, our bill would set forth regulations to outline good manufacturing practices for personal care products and prevent harmful products from ever being sold.

Our bill would also require companies to register with the FDA so that the agency knows who is manufacturing

personal care products and where they are being made before arriving in stores. Companies would also be required to disclose their list of ingredients, attest that they have safety records for their products, and report serious adverse events, such as infections that required medical treatment, to FDA within 15 days after being notified that one occurred.

This bill would also require the FDA to evaluate at least five ingredients per year for safety and whether they should be used in personal care products. There would be opportunities for companies, scientists, consumer groups, medical professionals, and other members of the public to weigh in not only on the safety of particular ingredients but also which ingredients should be a priority for review.

As I've said before, the "Personal Care Products Safety Act" is the result of many diverse groups working together to ensure businesses are able to provide the safest products possible to consumers. As such, this legislation also recognizes the needs of small businesses and provides flexibility to ensure they are able to comply with these new regulations while also upholding strong safety standards that protect consumers.

I am pleased that this legislation has the support of a broad coalition, including the Environmental Working Group, Beautycounter, Estee Lauder, Unilever, Johnson & Johnson, Revlon, L'Oreal USA, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, the Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs, the Endocrine Society, March of Dimes, National Alliance for Hispanic Health, the National Women's Health Network, Au Naturale Cosmetics, Burt's Bees Company, The Clorox Company, the Handcrafted Soap and Cosmetic Guild, and Procter & Gamble.

I want to thank Senator COLLINS for her support as well as her staff for their hard work on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in modernizing our outdated regulatory system for personal care products, and I hope the Senate will finally pass this long overdue legislation this year.

Thank you Madam President. I yield the Floor.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 2103. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to hold certain public employers liable in civil actions for deprivation of rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the "Accountability for Federal Law Enforcement Act."

This legislation recognizes the need to hold bad actors accountable—period.

In order to build trust in our system of justice, we must allow individuals the right to sue Federal law enforcement agencies when the actions of

their officers lead to a violation of rights.

This legislation would provide a right of action for an individual to sue a Federal law enforcement officer and agency for harm resulting from a violation of their civil and constitutional rights.

42 USC §1983 currently provides this right of action for state and local law enforcement officers who violate a person's rights. However, there is currently no statutory equivalent that extends this right to incidents involving federal law enforcement officers and agencies.

Because Americans lack this right, there is a gap in accountability that urgently needs to be filled. This legislation fills that gap by allowing individuals to sue federal officers, just as they can sue state and local officers. It would also allow individuals to sue federal law enforcement agencies. The United States Supreme Court has recognized that the federal government will not be liable in suit unless it waives its immunity and consents. This legislation recognizes the need for such a waiver.

While extending this right will not automatically end all cases of abuse by certain law enforcement officers, it will give the American people an important tool to fight against injustice while also demonstrating that the time is now to address police brutality.

While the United States Supreme Court has addressed the absence of a right of action against Federal officers before, the scope of the provided "remedy" has been kept extremely narrow. Without a statute in place, this right will continue to be under-utilized and could disappear whenever the Court sees fit.

Americans deserve better. We all deserve to have our constitutional rights respected, and we deserve a system that will hold bad actors accountable. This is too urgent a need to go unaddressed.

Public safety is a two-way street. We, as citizens, honor our officers and trust law enforcement to keep our streets safe and peaceful. In return, we expect officers to be held to account for bad behavior. Anything less undermines public safety.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the "Accountability for Federal Law Enforcement Act" as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2108. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate work disincentives for childhood disability beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, one topic there is much agreement on is the benefits of work, and our laws

should support those who want to work. The bill I am introducing today will change Social Security so that parents and their children will know that working will never disadvantage them in the future.

Let me explain the problem. Under current law, a child with a disability that began before age 22 may receive a Social Security benefit based on the work of a disabled, retired or deceased parent. Often the child receives this benefit for the rest of their life. Social Security provides the benefit because the child is usually dependent on their parents for financial support. The problem is that the law regards earnings by the child above \$1,310 a month as ending that dependency—even if the child is no longer able to maintain that level of work in the future. When that dependency ends, the child ceases to be eligible for the benefit from the parent. Instead, the child would receive a benefit based on their work. The benefit from the parent's work is often significantly larger than the child's own benefit. Because of this policy, parents of children with disabilities may prevent their child from working at their full potential, fearing that the work will cause the child to lose out on the larger benefit. We need to change Social Security to ensure parents and their children that working will not cause them to be worse off in the future.

To provide that assurance, I am introducing the Work Without Worry Act. The bill ensures that any individual with a disability that began before age 22 will receive the larger of the benefit from either their parent's work or the benefit from their own work. Any earnings from work—no matter how much—will not prevent the child from receiving a Social Security benefit from their parent's work as long as the child is eligible for disability insurance by the same impairment from before age 22. This legislation would give parents the assurance that their child with a disability can work without having to worry that the child will lose out on the full protections that Social Security provides.

I want to thank Kathy Holmquist, President of Pathways to Independence, Inc. in Portland, Oregon, who has been a leader in my state helping people with disabilities live and work with dignity. Kathy contacted me about the need for this legislation and I appreciate her advocacy and support. Additional thanks to The Arc for the technical assistance and endorsement of the bill. The bill is also endorsed by the American Network of Community Options and Resources (ANCOR), Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) Social Security Task Force, National Down Syndrome Congress, and The Association of University Centers on Disabilities. I am grateful that Social Security Subcommittee Chairman JOHN LARSON is introducing the companion bill in the House of Representatives. The Senate bill is cosponsored by Senators CASSIDY, BROWN, KLOBUCHAR, SANDERS, LEAHY, MERKLEY and CASEY.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

So ordered.

S. 2108

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Work Without Worry Act".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF WORK DISINCENTIVE FOR CHILDHOOD DISABILITY BENEFICIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by striking "is under a disability (as defined in section 223(d)) which began before he attained the age of 22, and" and inserting the following: "is under a disability (as defined in section 223(d)), and—

"(I) the physical or mental impairment (or combination of impairments) that is the basis for the finding of disability began before the child attained the age of 22 (or is of such a type that can reasonably be presumed to have begun before the child attained the age of 22, as determined by the Commissioner), and

"(II) the impairment or combination of impairments could have been the basis for a finding of disability (without regard to whether the child was actually engaged in substantial gainful activity) before the child attained age 22, and"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(11)(A) In the case of a child described in subparagraph (B)(ii) of paragraph (1) who—

"(i) has not attained early retirement age (as defined in section 216(1)(2));

"(ii) has filed an application for child's insurance benefits; and

"(iii) is insured for disability benefits (as determined under section 223(c)(1)) at the time of such filing; such application shall be deemed to be an application for both child's insurance benefits under this subsection and disability insurance benefits under section 223.

"(B) In the case of a child described in subparagraph (B)(ii) of paragraph (1) who—

"(i) has attained early retirement age (as defined in section 216(1)(2));

"(ii) has filed an application for child's insurance benefits; and

"(iii) is a fully insured individual (as defined in section 214(a)) at the time of such filing;

such application shall be deemed to be an application for both child's insurance benefits under this subsection and old-age insurance benefits under section 202(a).

"(C) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in the case of a child described in subparagraph (A) or (B), if, at the time of filing an application for child's insurance benefits, the amount of the monthly old-age or disability insurance benefit to which the child would be entitled is greater than the amount of the monthly child's insurance benefit to which the child would be entitled, the child shall not be entitled to a child's insurance benefit based on such application.

"(D) For purposes of subparagraph (C), the amount of the monthly old-age or disability benefit to which the child would be entitled shall be determined—

"(i) without regard to the primary insurance amount calculation described section 215(a)(7); and

"(ii) before application of section 224.

"(12) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), a child shall not be required to be continuously under a disability during the period between the date that the disability began and

the date that the application for child's insurance benefits is filed.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to applications filed on or after the date that is 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2124. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2124

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “American Business for American Companies Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 4715. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an executive agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

“(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

“(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is held by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

“(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of \$10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

“(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

“(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

“(B) **PENALTIES.**—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

“(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

“(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

“(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes on or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(2) **EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—**

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

“(B) **SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on January 18, 2017.

“(3) **SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—**

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

“(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

“(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

“(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

“(B) **DETERMINATION.**—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate)

may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(c) WAIVER.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an executive agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is—

“(A) required in the interest of national security; or

“(B) necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or federally funded—

“(i) programs that provide health benefits to individuals; or

“(ii) public health programs.

“(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The head of an executive agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) **TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.**—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

“(3) **SCOPE.**—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms ‘expanded affiliated group’, ‘foreign incorporated entity’, ‘person’, ‘domestic’, and ‘foreign’ have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

“(2) **SPECIAL RULES.**—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4714 the following new item:

“4715. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2339d. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

“(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

“(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

“(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of \$10,000,000, other than a

contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

“(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

“(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

“(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

“(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

“(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

“(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes on or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

“(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on January 18, 2017.

“(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

“(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

“(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

“(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

“(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(c) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or federally funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the congressional defense committees.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

“(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘expanded affiliated group’, ‘foreign incorporated entity’, ‘person’, ‘domestic’, and ‘foreign’ have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2339c the following new item:

“2339d. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”.

(3) FUTURE TRANSFER.—

(A) TRANSFER AND REDESIGNATION.—Section 2339d of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), is transferred to

chapter 364 of such title, inserted after section 4660, as added by section 1862(b) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283), and redesignated as section 4661.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(i) TARGET CHAPTER TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 364 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 1862(a) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283), is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4660 the following new item:

“Sec. 4661. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”.

(ii) ORIGIN CHAPTER TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (2), is amended by striking the item relating to section 2339d.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall take effect on January 1, 2022.

(D) REFERENCES; SAVINGS PROVISIONS; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Sections 1883 through 1885 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283) shall apply with respect to the amendments made under this paragraph as if such amendments were made under title XVIII of such Act.

(c) REGULATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall, for purposes of section 4714(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 41, United States Code, and section 2339d(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsections (a) and (b), respectively, prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2137. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish an Office of Rural Investment, to ensure that rural communities and regions are equitably represented in Federal decision-making for transportation policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2137

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rural Transportation Equity Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. RURAL INVESTMENT.

(a) OFFICE OF RURAL INVESTMENT.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 102 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting “(referred to in this section as the ‘Department’)” after “Department of Transportation”;

(B) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by inserting “(referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’)” after “Secretary of Transportation”;

(C) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “Department of Transportation” each place it appears and inserting “Department”;

(D) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(E) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) OFFICE OF RURAL INVESTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Department, within the Office of the Secretary, an Office of Rural Investment (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Office’).

“(2) LEADERSHIP.—The Office shall be headed by a Director for Rural Investment (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Director’) who shall be appointed by, and report directly to, the Secretary.

“(3) MISSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The mission of the Office shall be to coordinate with other offices and agencies within the Department and with other Federal agencies to further the goals and objectives described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) GOALS AND OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED.—The goals and objectives referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

“(i) to ensure that the unique needs and attributes of rural transportation, involving all modes, are fully addressed and prioritized during the development and implementation of transportation policies, programs, and activities within the Department;

“(ii) to improve coordination of Federal transportation policies, programs, and activities within the Department in a manner that expands economic development in rural communities and regions, and to provide recommendations for improvement, including additional internal realignments;

“(iii) to expand Federal transportation infrastructure investment in rural communities and regions, including by providing recommendations for changes in existing funding distribution patterns;

“(iv) to use innovation to resolve local and regional transportation challenges faced by rural communities and regions;

“(v) to promote and improve planning and coordination among rural communities and regions to maximize the unique competitive advantage in those locations while avoiding duplicative Federal, State and local investments; and

“(vi) to ensure that all rural communities and regions lacking resources receive proactive outreach, education, and technical assistance to improve access to Federal transportation programs.

“(4) DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR.—The Director shall—

“(A) be responsible for engaging in activities to carry out the mission described in paragraph (3);

“(B) organize, guide, and lead activities within the Department to address disparities in rural transportation infrastructure to improve safety, economic development, and

quality of life in rural communities and regions;

“(C) provide information and outreach to rural communities and regions concerning the availability and eligibility requirements of participating in programs of the Department;

“(D) help rural communities and regions—

“(i) identify competitive economic advantages and transportation investments that ensure continued economic growth; and

“(ii) avoid duplicative transportation investments;

“(E) serve as a resource for assisting rural communities and regions with respect to Federal transportation programs;

“(F) identify—

“(i) Federal statutes, regulations, and policies that may impede the Department from supporting effective rural infrastructure projects that address national transportation goals; and

“(ii) potential measures to solve or mitigate those issues;

“(G) identify improved, simplified, and streamlined internal processes to help limited-resource rural communities and regions access transportation investments;

“(H) recommend changes and initiatives for the Secretary to consider;

“(I) ensure and coordinate a routine rural consultation on the development of policies, programs, and activities of the Department;

“(J) serve as an advocate within the Department on behalf of rural communities and regions; and

“(K) work in coordination with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Commerce, the Federal Communications Commission, and other Federal agencies, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, in carrying out the duties described in subparagraphs (A) through (J).

“(5) CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS.—For the purpose of carrying out the mission of the Office under paragraph (3), the Secretary may enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other agreements as necessary, including with research centers, institutions of higher education, States, units of local government, nonprofit organizations, or a combination of any of those entities—

“(A) to conduct research on transportation investments that promote rural economic development;

“(B) to solicit information in the development of policy, programs, and activities of the Department that can improve infrastructure investment and economic development in rural communities and regions;

“(C) to develop educational and outreach materials, including the conduct of workshops, courses, and certified training for rural communities and regions that can further the mission and goals of the Office and the Department; and

“(D) to carry out any other activities, as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.

“(6) GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may award competitive grants to an entity described in subparagraph (B) to support expanded education, outreach, and technical assistance to rural communities and regions.

“(B) ENTITY DESCRIBED.—An entity referred to in subparagraph (A) is a nonprofit organization or an institution of higher education that has not less than 3 years of experience providing meaningful transportation technical assistance or advocacy services to rural communities and regions.

“(7) EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary shall ensure that not more than 4 full-time equivalent employees are assigned to the Office.

“(8) COORDINATION WITHIN AND AMONG OTHER OFFICES AND AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate not fewer than 1 representative from each office or agency of the Department described in subparagraph (B) who shall be responsible for leading the efforts within that office or agency to further the goals and objectives described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3).

“(B) OFFICES AND AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—The offices and agencies of the Department referred to in subparagraph (A) are each of the following:

“(i) The Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

“(ii) The Office of the General Counsel.

“(iii) The Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.

“(iv) The Federal Aviation Administration.

“(v) The Federal Highway Administration.

“(vi) The Federal Railroad Administration.

“(vii) The Federal Transit Administration.

“(viii) The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.

“(ix) The Office of Public Affairs.

“(x) Any other office or agency of the Department that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(C) DUTIES.—The Chief Infrastructure Funding Officer of the Department and the representatives designated under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall—

“(I) meet bimonthly; and

“(II) recommend initiatives to the Office; and

“(ii) may participate in all meetings and relevant activities of the Office to provide input and guidance relevant to rural transportation infrastructure projects and issues.

“(9) ADDITIONAL INPUT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall seek input from the offices and agencies of the Department described in subparagraph (B) to further the goals and objectives described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3).

“(B) OFFICES AND AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—The offices and agencies of the Department referred to in subparagraph (A) are each of the following:

“(i) The Maritime Administration.

“(ii) The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

“(iii) The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

“(10) REPORT.—Each year, the Office shall submit to the Secretary a report describing—

“(A) the objectives of the Office for the coming year; and

“(B) how the objectives of the Office were accomplished in the previous year.

“(11) APPLICABILITY.—In carrying out the mission of the Office under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall consider as rural any area considered to be a rural area under a Federal transportation program of the Department.”.

(2) COUNCIL ON CREDIT AND FINANCE.—Section 117(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(I) The Director for Rural Investment.”.

(b) RURAL TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The term “advisory council” means the rural transportation advisory council established under paragraph (2).

(B) RELEVANT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “relevant committees of Congress” means—

(i) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives;

(ii) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(iii) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(iv) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(v) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(vi) the Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(vii) the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(C) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Transportation.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a rural transportation advisory council to consult with and advise the Office of Rural Investment.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall be composed of 15 members, appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(i) not fewer than 1 shall be a representative from an institution of higher education or extension program;

(ii) not fewer than 1 shall be a representative from an organization promoting business and economic development, such as a chamber of commerce, a local government institution, or a planning organization;

(iii) not fewer than 1 shall be a representative from a financing entity;

(iv) not fewer than 1 shall have experience in health, mobility, or emergency services;

(v) not fewer than 1 shall have experience in transportation safety;

(vi) not fewer than 1 shall have experience with workforce access;

(vii) not fewer than 1 shall have experience with tourism and recreational activities;

(viii) not fewer than 1 shall have—

(I) experience with rural supply chains, such as direct-to-consumer supply chains; and

(II) wholesale distribution experience;

(ix) not fewer than 1 shall have experience in emerging or innovative technologies relating to rural transportation networks;

(x) not fewer than 1 shall have experience in food, nutrition, and grocery access;

(xi) not fewer than 1 shall represent agriculture, nutrition, or forestry; and

(xii) not fewer than 1 shall have experience with historically underserved regions, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall appoint members to the advisory council in a manner that ensures, to the maximum extent practicable, that the geographic and economic diversity of rural communities and regions of the United States are represented.

(C) TIMING OF INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the initial members of the advisory council.

(D) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a member of the advisory council shall be appointed for a term of 3 years.

(ii) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—Of the members first appointed to the advisory council—

(I) 5, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 3 years;

(II) 5, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

(III) 5, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 1 year.

(E) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy on the advisory council—

(i) shall not affect the power of the advisory council; and

(ii) shall be filled as soon as practicable and in the same manner as the original appointment.

(F) CONSECUTIVE TERMS.—An appointee to the advisory council may serve 1 additional, consecutive term if the member is reappointed by the Secretary.

(4) MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall meet not less than twice per year, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the initial members of the advisory council are appointed under paragraph (3)(C), the advisory council shall hold the first meeting of the advisory council.

(5) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall—

(i) advise the Office of Rural Investment on issues related to rural needs relating to Federal transportation programs;

(ii) evaluate and review ongoing research activities relating to rural transportation networks, including new and emerging barriers to economic development and access to investments;

(iii) develop recommendations for any changes to Federal law, regulations, internal Department of Transportation policies or guidance, or other measures that would eliminate barriers for rural access or improve rural equity in transportation investments;

(iv) examine methods of maximizing the number of opportunities for assistance for rural communities and regions under Federal transportation programs, including expanded outreach and technical assistance;

(v) examine methods of encouraging intergovernmental and local resource cooperation to mitigate duplicative investments in key rural communities and regions and improve the efficiencies in the delivery of Federal transportation programs;

(vi) evaluate other methods of creating new opportunities for rural communities and regions; and

(vii) address any other relevant issues as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(B) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the initial members of the advisory council are appointed under paragraph (3)(C), and every 2 years thereafter through 2026, the advisory council shall submit to the Secretary and the relevant committees of Congress a report describing the recommendations developed under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(6) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(A) COMPENSATION.—A member of the advisory council shall serve without compensation.

(B) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the advisory council shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(7) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the advisory council shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date on which the initial members are appointed under paragraph (3)(C).

(B) EXTENSION.—Before the date on which the advisory council terminates, the Secretary may renew the advisory council for 1 or more 2-year periods.

(C) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 274—DESIGNATING JULY 24, 2021, AS “NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY”

Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. MARSHALL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 274

Whereas pioneering men and women, recognized as “cowboys”, helped to establish the American West;

Whereas the cowboy embodies honesty, integrity, courage, compassion, respect, a strong work ethic, and patriotism;

Whereas the cowboy spirit exemplifies strength of character, sound family values, and good common sense;

Whereas the cowboy archetype transcends ethnicity, gender, geographic boundaries, and political affiliations;

Whereas the cowboy, who lives off the land and works to protect and enhance the environment, is an excellent steward of the land and its creatures;

Whereas cowboy traditions have been a part of American culture for generations;

Whereas the cowboy continues to be an important part of the economy through the work of many thousands of ranchers across the United States who contribute to the economic well-being of every State;

Whereas millions of fans watch professional and working ranch rodeo events annually, making rodeo one of the most-watched sports in the United States;

Whereas membership and participation in rodeo and other organizations that promote and encompass the livelihood of cowboys span every generation and transcend race and gender;

Whereas the cowboy is a central figure in literature, film, and music and occupies a central place in the public imagination;

Whereas the cowboy is an American icon; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by cowboys and cowgirls to their communities should be recognized and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 24, 2021, as “National Day of the American Cowboy”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 275—ACKNOWLEDGING AND APOLOGIZING FOR THE MISTREATMENT OF, AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST, LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVED THE UNITED STATES IN THE ARMED FORCES, THE FOREIGN SERVICE, AND THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred

to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.:

S. RES. 275

Whereas the Federal Government discriminated against and terminated hundreds of thousands of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (referred to in this preamble as “LGBT”) individuals who served the United States in the Armed Forces, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service (referred to in this preamble as “civilian employees”) for decades, causing untold harm to those individuals professionally, financially, socially, and medically, among other harms;

Whereas Congress enacted legislation, led oversight hearings, and issued reports and public pronouncements against LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees;

Whereas the policy that led to the discharge and systematic screening of gay, lesbian, and bisexual military service members was codified in a 1949 decree by the newly-consolidated Department of Defense, which mandated that “homosexual personnel, irrespective of sex, should not be permitted to serve in any branch of the Armed Forces in any capacity and prompt separation of known homosexuals from the Armed Forces is mandatory”;

Whereas the Federal Government maintained policies to drive hundreds of thousands of LGBT military service members, who honorably served the United States in uniform, including many who were fighting in wars around the world, from its military ranks;

Whereas, in 1993, Congress enacted the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 107 Stat. 1547), which contained the so-called “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy that prohibited lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members from disclosing their sexual orientation while they served in the Armed Forces;

Whereas, despite the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, LGBT military service members continued to be investigated and discharged solely on the basis of the sexual orientation of those military service members;

Whereas historians have estimated that at least 100,000 military service members were forced out of the Armed Forces between World War II and 2011 simply for being LGBT, while countless others were forced to hide their identities and live in fear while serving;

Whereas, although the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy was intended to allow qualified citizens to serve in the Armed Forces regardless of their sexual orientation, the policy was inherently discriminatory against LGBT military service members because it prohibited those service members from disclosing their sexual orientation;

Whereas, with the enactment of the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (10 U.S.C. 654 note; Public Law 111-321), Congress joined military leaders in acknowledging that lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members serve the United States just as bravely and well as other military service members;

Whereas the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (10 U.S.C. 654 note; Public Law 111-321) and the 2016 policy shift of the Department of Defense, which permitted transgender individuals to enlist and openly serve in the Armed Forces, has made the Armed Forces stronger and more effective;

Whereas military leaders have likewise acknowledged that, in addition to lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members, transgender service members also serve the United States just as bravely and well as other service members;

Whereas, under the pressures of the Cold War, and at the instigation and lead of Congress, the Federal Government also pursued anti-LGBT policies, which resulted in tens of thousands of LGBT civilian employees being terminated;

Whereas the Department of State began investigations into employees for alleged homosexual activity as early as the 1940s;

Whereas following Senator Joseph McCarthy’s targeting of gay employees in the Department of State in 1950, the Senate held hearings on “The Employment of Homosexuals and other Sex Perverts in the Government”, which—

(1) led to the issuance of a widely read report that falsely asserted that gay people posed a security risk because they could be easily blackmailed; and

(2) found that gay people were unsuitable employees because “one homosexual can pollute a Government office”;

Whereas, in response to Senator McCarthy’s allegations against gay people, the Department of State increased its persecution of lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees;

Whereas more than 1,000 Department of State employees were dismissed due to their sexual orientation, and many more individuals were prevented from joining the Department of State due to discriminatory hiring practices;

Whereas thousands of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals served honorably in the Department of State as Foreign Service officers, Foreign Service specialists, civil servants, and contractors, upholding the values, and advancing the interests, of the United States even as the country discriminated against them;

Whereas the effort to purge gay and lesbian employees from the Federal Government was codified in 1953 when President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10450 (18 Fed. Reg. 2489; relating to security requirements for Government employment), which—

(1) defined “perversion” as a security threat; and

(2) mandated that every civilian employee and contractor pass a security clearance;

Whereas, over many decades, the Federal Government, led by security officials in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Service Commission (referred to in this preamble as the “CSC”), and nearly every other agency of the Federal Government, investigated, harassed, interrogated, and terminated thousands of lesbian, gay, and bisexual civilian employees for no other reason than the sexual orientation of those employees;

Whereas these discriminatory policies by the Federal Government, the largest employer in the United States, encouraged similar efforts at the State and local level, particularly in higher education and the private sector;

Whereas, in 1969, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled in *Norton v. Macy*, 417 F.2d 1161 (1969) that—

(1) “homosexual conduct” may never be the sole cause for dismissal of a protected civilian employee; and

(2) the potential embarrassment stemming from the private conduct of a civilian employee may not affect the efficiency of the Federal civil service;

Whereas, despite the decision in *Norton v. Macy*, the CSC continued its efforts to rid the Federal Government of gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees until 1973, when the United States District Court for the Northern District of California ruled in *Society for Individual Rights, Inc. v. Hampton*, 63 F.R.D. 399 (1973) that the exclusion or discharge from Federal civil service of any lesbian,

gay, or bisexual person because of prejudice was prohibited;

Whereas many Federal Government agencies, including the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State, none of which were subject to the rules of the CSC, continued to harass and seek to exclude lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals from their ranks until 1995, when President Bill Clinton issued Executive Order 12968 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note; relating to access to classified information), which barred the practice of denying a Federal Government security clearance solely on the basis of sexual orientation;

Whereas transgender military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees continued to be harassed and excluded from Federal civil service until 2014, when President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13672 (79 Fed. Reg. 42971; relating to further amendments to Executive Order 11478, Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government, and Executive Order 11246, Equal Employment Opportunity), which prohibited the Federal Government and Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity;

Whereas, on January 9, 2017, Secretary of State John Kerry issued a formal apology for the pattern of discrimination against LGBT Foreign Service members and civilian employees at the Department of State;

Whereas, despite persecution and systematic mistreatment by the Federal Government beginning in the early 1940s though the 1990s, including what historians have labeled as the “Lavender Scare”, LGBT individuals have never stopped honorably serving the United States;

Whereas LGBT individuals continued to make significant contributions to the United States through their work as clerks and lawyers, surgeons and nurses, Purple Heart recipients and Navy Seals, translators and air traffic controllers, engineers and astronomers, teachers and diplomats, rangers and Postal Service workers, and advisors and policy makers;

Whereas other countries throughout the world, including some of the closest allies of the United States, have apologized for similarly discriminating against LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees; and

Whereas, in order for the United States to heal and move forward, the Federal Government must accord all LGBT individuals who were discriminated against by, wrongfully terminated by, and excluded from serving in the Armed Forces, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service the same acknowledgment and apology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

The Senate—

(1) acknowledges and condemns the discrimination against, wrongful termination of, and exclusion from the Federal civil service, the Foreign Service, and the Armed Forces of the thousands of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (referred to in this section as “LGBT”) individuals who were affected by the anti-LGBT policies of the Federal Government;

(2) on behalf of the United States, apologizes to—

(A) the affected LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees; and

(B) the families of those service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the Federal Government to treat all military service

members, Foreign Service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees and retirees, including LGBT individuals, with equal respect and fairness.

SEC. 2. DISCLAIMER.

Nothing in this resolution—

(1) authorizes or supports any claim against the United States; or

(2) serves as a settlement of any claim against the United States.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, Senator Baldwin and I are pleased to introduce a resolution that acknowledges and apologizes for the mistreatment of and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals who have served our nation as civil servants or members of the Armed Forces and Foreign Service. This systemic mistreatment and discrimination of members of the LGBT community began as early as the 1940s and continued well into the 1990s and is often termed as the Lavender Scare by historians. During this time, it is estimated that 100,000 service members were forced out of the Armed Forces between World War II and 2011. In addition, more than 1,000 State Department employees were dismissed due to their alleged sexual orientation, and many more were prevented from serving due to discriminatory hiring practices.

Policies such as the 1949 decree by the Department of Defense mandating that “homosexual personnel, irrespective of sex, should not be permitted to serve in any branch of the Armed Forces” led to the mass discharge and systemic screening of gay, lesbian, and bisexual military service members. Similar policies within the State Department followed led to mass dismissals and terminations of Foreign Service and civil service employees. Subsequently, policies were enacted across the Federal government targeting members of the LGBT community. To this day, historians do not know the exact number of people impacted. However, despite these harmful and discriminatory policies, LGBT people continued to faithfully serve and make significant contributions to the United States, many of whom became clerks and lawyers, surgeons and nurses, Purple Heart recipients and Navy Seals, translators and air traffic controllers, engineers and astronomers, teachers and diplomats, and rangers and postal workers.

It is time to acknowledge the harm caused to these Americans, their families, and our country by depriving LGBT people of the right to serve as federal civil servants, diplomats, or in the Armed Services. This Senate resolution takes a stand on the side of respect for LGBT Americans who have served our nation and reaffirms our commitment to treat all public servants with fairness and equality, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. I'm proud to introduce this Senate resolution during Pride Month to reaffirm our nation's commitment to treat everyone, including LGBT Americans, with equal respect and fairness. I will continue working

toward advancing equality for all LGBT people in Virginia and across our nation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATE RESOLUTION 276—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA GATORS FOR WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN'S TENNIS CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. Rubio (for himself and Mr. Scott of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 276

Whereas, on May 22, 2021, the University of Florida Gators Men's Tennis Team (referred to in this preamble as the “Gators”) won the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NCAA”) Division I Men's Tennis Championship;

Whereas the 2021 NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Championship is the first NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Championship the Gators have won;

Whereas the Gators defeated Baylor University's Men's Tennis Team in the NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Championship;

Whereas this marks the 42nd national title for the University of Florida Gators Athletics programs;

Whereas men's tennis is the 15th sport in which the University of Florida has won a national title;

Whereas the University of Florida is 1 of 2 programs in the Nation to win at least 1 national championship in every fully contested season since the 2008–2009 season;

Whereas the championship victory clinching match was won by Ben Shelton, son of Gators Head Coach Bryan Shelton;

Whereas Gators player Blaise Bicknell—

(1) holds a perfect record in dual matches in his career; and

(2) is the fourth player in Gators history to go undefeated in dual matches;

Whereas Gators Head Coach Bryan Shelton—

(1) is the fifth coach across all NCAA sports to coach a men's and women's national championship winning team; and

(2) the first coach in NCAA history to lead a men's program and women's program to a NCAA Division I Tennis Championship; and

Whereas the following entire Gator roster and coaching staff contributed to the NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Championship victory: Associate Head Coach Tanner Stump, Volunteer Assistant Coach Scott Perelman, and student athletes Andy Andrade, Brian Berdusco, Blaise Bicknell, Josh Goodger, Will Grant, Lukas Greif, Johannes Ingildsen, Sam Riffice, Ben Shelton, and Duarte Vale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Florida Gators Men's Tennis Team and the students, alumni, faculty, staff, and trustees of the University of Florida, for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Tennis Championship; and

(2) respectfully directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the President of the University of Florida, Kent Fuchs;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Florida, Scott Stricklin; and

(C) the Head Coach of the University of Florida Gators Men's Tennis Team, Bryan Shelton.

SENATE RESOLUTION 277—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI REBELS WOMEN'S GOLF TEAM ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN'S GOLF CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. Wicker (for himself and Mrs. Hyde-Smith) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 277

Whereas, on Wednesday, May 26, 2021, the University of Mississippi Rebels Women's golf team won the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NCAA”) Division I women's golf championship at Grayhawk Golf Club in Scottsdale, Arizona;

Whereas, on winning the 2021 NCAA Division I women's golf championship, the University of Mississippi women's golf team became the first women's team in University history to win an NCAA national championship;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team claimed the first NCAA national championship in a team sport for the University since the football team won the 1962 NCAA Division I football championship;

Whereas the appearance of the University of Mississippi women's golf team in the NCAA Division I women's golf championship was the first appearance in an NCAA national championship game for an athletics team of the University since 1995;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team defeated the second place Oklahoma State University Cowgirls 4–1 in match play;

Whereas Chiarra Tamburlini secured a 6–and–5 win, the largest margin of victory in NCAA championship match history;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team was under the leadership of 2020 Southeastern Conference (referred to in this preamble as the “SEC”) Coach of the Year Kory Henkes and Assistant Coach Zack Byrd;

Whereas Coach Kory Henkes has led the University of Mississippi women's golf team to incredible success during her 6 seasons at the helm, including last season, when she led the program to 4 team tournament titles and set the record for most wins in a single season;

Whereas Julia Johnson was named a first-team All-American and first-team All-SEC;

Whereas Kennedy Swann was named second-team All-SEC, with the national championship bringing her career record in match play to 10–2;

Whereas members of the University of Mississippi women's golf team have been honored by various awards throughout the 2020–2021 season, including the selection of Julia Johnson to represent the United States in the Arnold Palmer Cup;

Whereas the University of Mississippi now boasts 26 total NCAA national championships;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team was ranked 5th in the United States by Golfweek and the Golfstat Team Rankings;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team, composed of Julia Johnson, Kennedy Swann, Chiarra Tamburlini, and teammates McKinley Cunningham, Ellen Hume, Ellen Hutchinson-Kay, Andrea Lignell, Macy Somoskey, and Smilla Sonderby displayed outstanding dedication, teamwork, and sportsmanship throughout the 2020–2021 season; and

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team has brought great pride and honor—

- (1) to the University of Mississippi;
- (2) to loyal fans of the University of Mississippi; and
- (3) to the entire State of Mississippi: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Mississippi women's golf team, including the athletes, coaches, faculty, students, and alumni of the University of Mississippi, on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's golf championship;

(2) recognizes the University of Mississippi for its excellence as an institution of higher education; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Chancellor of the University of Mississippi, Dr. Glenn Boyce;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Mississippi, Keith Carter; and

(C) the head coach of the University of Mississippi women's golf team, Kory Henkes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 278—RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED SPINAL ASSOCIATION, A LEADING NATIONAL ADVOCACY ORGANIZATION THAT IS DEDICATED TO PROMOTING THE INDEPENDENCE AND ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF ALL PEOPLE LIVING WITH SPINAL CORD INJURIES AND NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS, INCLUDING VETERANS, AND PROVIDING SUPPORT AND INFORMATION TO THEIR LOVED ONES, CARE PROVIDERS, AND PERSONAL SUPPORT NETWORKS

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:.

S. RES. 278

Whereas, in 1946, a group of returning veterans from World War II in New York, New York, formed the organization now known as United Spinal Association to address the needs of paralyzed veterans;

Whereas, in 1948, members of this organization advocated for and secured the first accessible housing bill in the United States (the Act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 500; Public Law 80-702)), which provided Federal funds for the building of accessible homes for paralyzed veterans;

Whereas, in 1968, members of this organization advocated for the passage of the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.), which guarantees equal access to federally-funded buildings and facilities for wheelchair users and all people of the United States with disabilities;

Whereas, in 1970, James J. Peters, who would later lead United Spinal Association, exposed the deplorable conditions that paralyzed Vietnam veterans faced at the Bronx Veterans Administration Hospital with an article in LIFE magazine, leading the Veterans Administration to establish a national spinal cord injury service office to address the needs of paralyzed veterans and the renovation of the Bronx Veterans Administration Hospital, which was later named for Peters;

Whereas, in 1985, New York City settled a lawsuit initiated by United Spinal Association, agreeing to make all city buses, key

subway stations and commuter rail stations, and all new transit stations accessible to wheelchair users, and New York City established a paratransit system for people unable to use mass transit, leading to a model that would be incorporated as part of the transportation provisions of the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.);

Whereas, regardless of a person's level of abilities, United Spinal Association seeks to build an inclusive world that—

(1) removes barriers, particularly for wheelchair users;

(2) embraces the talents of all people with disabilities to achieve their full potential; and

(3) provides people with disabilities equal opportunities to pursue their interests and dreams;

Whereas United Spinal Association continues to support and advocate on behalf of more than 2,000,000 people in the United States living with spinal cord injuries or neurological disorders, as well as veterans, through—

(1) proven programs and services, and nurturing innovative self-reliance, advocacy, and leadership;

(2) empowering its members, their loved ones, care providers, and stakeholders with resources, one-on-one assistance, and peer support;

(3) promoting independence through employment opportunities and inclusion into mainstream society; and

(4) advocating for greater disability rights, including access to health care, rehabilitation, mobility equipment, transportation, community services, and the built environment; and

Whereas the legacy of James J. Peters, who once described the straightforward strategy in advocating for people in the United States with disabilities as simply refusing to accept no for an answer, is alive and well throughout United Spinal Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that throughout 75 years of service, United Spinal Association has made significant contributions to the lives of people in the United States with disabilities, including veterans;

(2) honors United Spinal Association for its continued role in supporting and advocating for people with spinal cord injuries and neurological disorders, as well as all veterans; and

(3) commemorates 2021 as the 75th anniversary of the founding of United Spinal Association.

SENATE RESOLUTION 279—DESIGNATING JUNE 21, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 25, 2021, AS “NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY EDUCATION WEEK”

Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CASIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:.

S. RES. 279

Whereas, according to a 2017 projection, the United States will face a shortage of 1,800,000 cybersecurity workers by 2022;

Whereas recent cyberattacks on the United States have highlighted the cybersecurity workforce shortage in the United States that—

(1) poses a threat to the national security of the United States;

(2) jeopardizes the economy of the United States;

(3) puts the digital privacy of the United States at risk; and

(4) threatens the critical infrastructure of the United States;

Whereas expanding cybersecurity education opportunities is important to address the cybersecurity workforce shortage and prepare the United States for ongoing and future national security threats;

Whereas cybersecurity education can provide learning and career opportunities for kindergarten through grade 12 students across the United States, as well as bolster the capacity of the domestic workforce to defend the United States and secure the economy of the United States;

Whereas, in 2020, introduced as part of the Providing Resources for Ongoing Training and Education in Cyber Technologies Act of 2020 and enacted as part of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283), Congress authorized the Cybersecurity Education Training Assistance Program, a Department of Homeland Security initiative to provide cybersecurity career awareness, curricular resources, and professional development to elementary and secondary schools; and

Whereas ensuring access to cybersecurity education for all students in the United States regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or geographic location will expand opportunities for good-paying jobs in high-demand fields: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 21, 2021 through June 25, 2021, as “National Cybersecurity Education Week”;

(2) encourages the people of the United States to acknowledge the importance of cybersecurity education;

(3) encourages educational and training institutions to increase the understanding and awareness of cybersecurity education at such institutions; and

(4) commits to—

(A) raising awareness about cybersecurity education; and

(B) taking legislative actions to address cybersecurity education expansion and address the cybersecurity workforce shortage.

SENATE RESOLUTION 280—SUPPORTING A STABLE COLOMBIA AND OPPOSING ANY THREAT TO DEMOCRACY IN COLOMBIA

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:.

S. RES. 280

Whereas Colombia is among the oldest standing democracies in Latin America;

Whereas the United States established diplomatic relations with Colombia in 1822;

Whereas Colombia is a constitutional republic where the people of Colombia hold the power and elect representatives to exercise that power;

Whereas, after many years of violence and armed conflict, in 2021 Colombia is the strongest ally to the United States in Latin America;

Whereas, with the support of the United States, Colombia has transformed itself between 2001 and 2021 from a volatile and near-failed state into a rich democracy with a growing free market economy;

Whereas May 15, 2022, will mark the 10-year anniversary of the entry into force of the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, which has supported economic growth and employment opportunities in both Colombia and the United States;

Whereas the United States maintains support for Colombia in response to the COVID-

19 pandemic, including provision of excess vaccine doses to help revitalize the economy of Colombia;

Whereas presidential and legislative elections were held in Colombia in 2018, and the people of Colombia elected Iván Duque Márquez president in a second round of elections that impartial international observers considered free and fair and the most peaceful in decades;

Whereas the United States and Colombia share a commitment to promoting security, prosperity, human rights, and democracy in Colombia and across the Western Hemisphere;

Whereas, in recent years, the Government of Colombia has taken courageous steps to enforce the law, stop drug traffickers, and rein in foreign terrorist organizations like the National Liberation Army (referred to in this preamble as the “ELN”) and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (referred to in this preamble as the “FARC”);

Whereas the United States continues to support the efforts of the Government of Colombia for peace, including protection of vulnerable populations such as Indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities, support for human rights defenders, provision of greater educational opportunities, increases in public and private investments, especially in rural areas, and respect for human rights and the rule of law;

Whereas the United States maintains a strong commitment to cooperating with the Government of Colombia to investigate, arrest, and prosecute members of transnational criminal organizations and to dismantle terrorist groups like the ELN, the FARC, and Hezbollah, whose illicit activities, specifically narco-trafficking, devastate the citizens of Colombia and Latin America;

Whereas, since 2016, the United States has provided more than \$1,000,000,000 in direct and indirect support to peace implementation in Colombia;

Whereas Colombia is an essential partner of the United States in continuing efforts to support the courageous people of Venezuela in their fight for freedom, democracy, and economic prosperity against the dictatorship of Nicolás Maduro by generously hosting and providing aid to nearly 1,800,000 citizens of Venezuela as of June 2021 and by providing them essential services such as healthcare and education;

Whereas, in February 2021, President Duque issued temporary protective status with work authorization to citizens of Venezuela living in Colombia;

Whereas the leadership of the Government of Colombia during the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela has been critical in organizing regional support for Interim President Juan Guaidó, as well as in denouncing the dictatorship of Maduro and helping implement policies to isolate his narcoterrorist regime, specifically through the Lima Group and the Organization of American States;

Whereas the security situation in Colombia has improved significantly between 2000 and 2021, but the migrant influx from Venezuela and the economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic have hurt the economy of Colombia, creating unique challenges for Colombia that demand action and support from strong democratic allies like the United States;

Whereas freedom of speech, freedom to peacefully assemble, and other human rights are inalienable, and any acts of excess force against peaceful protesters should be condemned and investigated; and

Whereas enemies of freedom, such as the communist regime of Raul Castro in Cuba and the Maduro regime in Venezuela, exploit and abuse the vulnerable and individuals simply asking for their voices to be heard by

promoting violent unrest, vandalism, and destruction of property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares its firm commitment to Colombia, the strongest ally of the United States in Latin America;

(2) opposes any effort to undermine the democracy or sovereignty of Colombia;

(3) encourages the international community to stand for democracy in Colombia and to condemn any efforts to undermine that democracy;

(4) condemns any regime in any country, such as Cuba, Venezuela, or Iran, that gives aid to terrorist groups in Colombia by providing training, weapons, or funding, or by hosting those groups within the borders of the nation-state;

(5) strongly condemns the terrorist attack perpetrated on June 15, 2021, and attributed to the National Liberation Army by the Duque administration, against the military base of the 30th Army Brigade of Colombia in Cúcuta, Colombia, the northeastern border city near Venezuela, where United States soldiers were present, at least 36 people were injured, and infrastructure of the military base was destroyed;

(6) condemns any blockade of essential goods and services, including imports or transports of medicine or food, and strongly condemns all violence or attacks against innocent citizens of Colombia or their private property or businesses;

(7) recognizes that a stable and prosperous Colombia serves United States interests in Latin America; and

(8) reemphasizes the shared democratic values of Colombia and the United States through free and fair elections with the peaceful participation of all political leaders and parties, accompanied by credible local and international observers, including in the presidential elections in Colombia in 2022.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on

Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREADS AND SPENDING OVERSIGHT

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threads and Spending Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Parker Loy, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges for today, June 17, 2021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 21, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, June 21; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Fonzone nomination; finally, that the cloture motions filed during today's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 21, 2021, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:48 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 21, 2021, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CARLOS DEL TORO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE KENNETH J. BRAITHWAITE.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

DAMON Y. SMITH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE J. PAUL COMPTON, JR.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

MICHAEL D. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE, VICE BARBARA STEWART.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SANDRA D. BRUCE, OF DELAWARE, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE KATHLEEN S. TIGHE, RESIGNED.

CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD

MARGARET A. BURNHAM, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

CLAYBORNE CARSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

GABRIELLE M. DUDLEY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

HENRY KLIBANOFF, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. EDWIN J. DEEDRICK, JR.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17, 2021:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU, OF ALASKA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

MATTHEW T. QUINN, OF MONTANA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR MEMORIAL AFFAIRS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TANYA MARIE TRUJILLO, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

JOHN K. TIEN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

CHRIS INGLIS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE NATIONAL CYBER DIRECTOR.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN

THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 305:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MICHAEL F. MCALLISTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 305:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PAUL F. THOMAS

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

PAMELA A. MELROY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 304:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. LINDA L. FAGAN

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

RICHARD W. SPINRAD, OF OREGON, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES J. CLARK AND ENDING WITH LUKE P. STRITTMATTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 27, 2021.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LISA M. THOMPSON AND ENDING WITH TARA E. LARKIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 27, 2021.